2000

What Goes on in Cross -Language Encounters: the Tactics and Strategies of Interactional Grammar.

Stuart Lee Stewart
Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College

WHAT GOES ON IN CROSS-LANGUAGE ENCOUNTERS: THE TACTICS AND STRATEGIES OF INTERACTIONAL GRAMMAR

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Interdepartmental Program in Linguistics

by
Stuart Lee Stewart
B.A., Texas A&M University, 1973
M.A., Texas A&M University, 1992
May 2000

UMI Number: 9963965

Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

DEDICATION

In loving memory of my father, Arthur Stewart, whose passion for language and ceaseless quest for knowledge was an inspiration to thousands.

To my mother, Billie Stewart, for housing me, feeding me, and otherwise enabling me to make this journey.

To my true companion, Richard Maloney, without whose nurturing and continued encouragement this work would never have been completed on a timely basis. Te quiero mucho.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My heartfelt appreciation goes to Dr. Jill Brody, chair of my committee, mentor and friend, who always asked the right questions and never gave up on me. I am grateful to committee members Dr. Hugh Buckingham, Dr. Janna Oetting, Dr. Victoria Rodrigo and Dr. Drew Gouvier for their invaluable comments. A special thanks to Dr. Arnulfo Ramírez and to Dr. Hugh Buckingham for giving me the opportunity to teach Spanish and linguistics, respectively. Without the students I taught and the knowledge I gained in both areas, this work would never have been conceived.

To Drs. Kathy Ferrara and Nancy Dyer, who encouraged me to continue my graduate education and served as outstanding models of professionalism in the field. To Dr. Ken Graft, who showed me that I could write a thesis and encouraged me to make my first conference presentation. To Dr. Meg Marshall and Dr. Margaret Parker, for being at that presentation at SCMLA in Ft. Worth in 1991 and befriending me, an act that brought me to LSU. To Dr. Sandy Thompson, whose Conversation and Grammar class at the 1995 Linguistics Institute prompted me to search for a connection in all my prior work. To Drs. Bob Lafayette, Arnulfo Ramírez and George Yule for imparting to me some of their vast knowledge about language learning and teaching. To Dr. Lyle Campbell for his volunteer tutoring. To Dr.

Susan Bacon, who fostered the development of my teaching and supervisory skills. To Dr. Barbara Danos, who challenged me to be the best teacher I could be and soothed my ruffled feathers on some days when I was not. To Antonio Caraballo, Dr. Richard Curry, Dr. Lucia Harrison, Sheldon Lotten, Sergio Martínez, Martín Reyes-Durán, Terri Wilbanks and Bill Woodward, present and former colleagues, who have been an inspiration to me both in and out of the classroom.

To Dr. Megan Jones, who showed me the process of writing a dissertation -- that she survived it told me that I could, too. To Lyn LeJeune, Karen Lynch, Megan Melançon, Michell Rabalais, Jaan Ingle Troltenier and Diane Weiland, who helped me through some really painful times. To Michael Wuest, who taught me how to exercise regularly, a feat which helped me maintain my sanity throughout much of this journey. To David Herrell, who covered my classes when I ran off to assorted conferences. To Comfort Pratt-Panford and Lexie Wood, transplanted Aggies, both of whom never cease to inspire and encourage me. To Rick Hallett, for his endless funny e-mails and his countless postcards, which lifted my spirits when they were sagging. To Lynn Pearson, who toiled diligently with me during the Summer of 1993 and again in the Fall of 1995 to finish two seemingly endless tasks.

To Dr. Emily Batinski for her support over the years, most especially during the last semester. To Peggy Mc Neil and Sarah Burns for making sure that I had what I needed and met all my deadlines. To José Luis Montiel for supplying me with non-native speaker volunteers for my research and for introducing me to Héctor and Plinio González, who helped to recruit many of the native speakers. And to all who participated in my project, ¡MUCHAS GRACIAS! This work would not have been possible without you!

To the crew at CC's Gourmet Coffee House on George O'Neal Rd., who provided me with endless cups of coffee, frequent words of encouragement and a wonderful work space when the isolation of my office was driving me crazy or the dustbunnies at home were calling my name.

In addition, I am grateful to Rosie, Brian, Ashley, Lance, Jan, Kirsten, Charlotte, Teresa, Jim, Barbara, Martha, Betty, Maggie, Tonia, Sandy, Herbie, Jodie, Ellie, Judy, Gene, George, Mary, Fran, Shelley, Phyllis, Cindy, Kate, Chris, Jeff, Janice, Diane, Meg, Carla, Margaret, Linda, Dick, Betty, Katherine, Viki and others who walked the path alongside me. Each one of them touched my life in a very special way.

Finalmente, a los Luna -- les aprecio mucho por haber compartido conmigo su vida, su hogar y su país.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ALPHABETISMS

CA - Conversation Analysis

CAT - Communication Accommodation Theory

CLE - Cross-language encounter

DA - Discourse Analysis

FLL - Foreign Language Learning

FLT - Foreign Language Teaching

FSA - Face-Saving Action

FTA - Face-Threatening Action

L1 - First/native language

L2 - Second/foreign language

NS - Native Speaker

NNS - Non-native Speaker

PCA - Principle of Continuous Access

SAT - Speech Accommodation Theory

SLA - Second Language Acquisition

TL - Target Language

TRP - Transition Relevance Place

ZPD - Zone of Proximal Development

ABSTRACT

This investigation involves analysis of cross-language encounters (CLEs), spoken discourse between native speakers (NSs) and non-native speakers (NNSs) of Spanish involved in two types of interactions: simulated service encounters and free conversation. I use a multi-tiered framework comprised of: 1) Schiffrin's (1994) functionalist approach, 2) a model of interactional grammar adapted from Ochs, Schegloff and Thompson (1996), and 3) one of the principal assumptions from conversation analysis, which focusses on the organization of interaction, while maintaining that participants' behavior provides evidence for the units, patterns and rules that are a part of all spoken interaction.

Tactics and strategies examined include repetition, repair, and laughter. Repetition is discussed on five levels: 1) production, 2) comprehension, 3) discourse, 4) interpersonal, and 5) interactional (Tannen 1989). Grammatical and pragmatic aspects of repair are reinterpreted in the Vygotskyan (1986) tradition as regulation of speech and are discussed within the framework of accommodation theory (Giles 1973; Giles et al. 1987). Analysis of laughter results in the development of a new typological framework, which reveals an orderly diversity

of roles of laughter in spoken interaction and highlights the relationship between laughter and 'face' (Brown and Levinson 1983; Goffman 1967). As with regulation, the face threat of laughter is shown to be contingent upon the nature of the interaction, the relationship between interlocutors and the accommodation level of participants.

A central tenet of my investigation is the notion of the dialogic, which showcases the direct relationship of utterances to interlocutors, as well as to other utterances. Analysis of the negotiated interaction in these CLEs provides information that is vital to understanding the process of second language acquisition because it demonstrates: 1) how NNSs accept unknown input and how they react to feedback on their production, 2) the role of NSs in expediting the acquisition process and their contributions to a learner's developing grammar, and 3) how use of particular tactics and strategies (de Certeau 1984) can influence the balance of power in CLEs.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Cross-language Encounters: An Overview

This investigation involves analysis of spoken discourse between native speakers[1] (NSs) and non-native speakers (NNSs) of a language. According to Schiffrin (1994), discourse can be defined in two ways: as a particular unit of language (above the sentence) and as a particular analytical focus (structural or functional). Structuralists (e.g. Chomsky) see language as a mental concept, while functionalists view language as a societal phenomenon. In this research, I adopt a functionalist approach because, like Schiffrin, I believe that "language has functions that are external to the linguistic system itself and external functions influence the organization of the linguistic system" (1994:22). I combine this with an interactional approach, which embraces ideas from anthropology and sociology as well as linguistics. In addition, I apply one of the central assumptions from conversational analysis (CA), which focuses on the organization of interaction, while maintaining that participants' behavior provides evidence for the units,

patterns and rules that are a part of all spoken interaction (Schiffrin 1994; cf. Ochs, Schegloff and Thompson 1996).

Analysis of cross-language encounters (CLEs) can reveal much about the process of interaction between NSs and NNSs including: 1) the communicative roadblocks involved, 2) the tactical mechanisms language learners use to negotiate meaning in conversations with fluent speakers and 3) how L2 linguistic ability develops in the conversational process (Johnson 1993; cf. Lantolf and Frawley 1983; Gass and Varonis 1991; Hatch 1978, 1983; Lantolf and Appel 1988; Lantolf and Frawley 1985; Larsen-Freeman and Long 1991, Pica 1992b - for L2; Vygotsky 1986 - for L1). Further analysis of CLEs can establish some of the most effective strategies for NSs to employ in their interactions with language learners. Using a model of interactional grammar adapted from Ochs, Schegloff and Thompson (1996), I analyze examples extracted from two different types of data, simulated service encounters and free conversation, interactions between NSs and NNSs of varying proficiency levels. The analysis illustrates various tactics and strategies used by participants, elucidates the interface between grammar and pragmatics in CLEs and reveals how interactionally adept interlocutors can facilitate second language (L2) interactions (de Certeau 1984; Vygotsky 1986).

The CLEs I analyze are both important and interesting for a variety of reasons. First, most of the research in this area has involved English as a Second Language (ESL) learners; so examination of discourse between learners and NSs of Spanish will expand the grammatical and pragmatic knowledge base and its place in theory beyond an almost-exclusive focus on English. Furthermore, the majority of other L2 investigations have focused on learners in an L2 setting, while a part of this project involves learners in a Foreign Language (FL) setting outside of the classroom. The goals of the speakers in each arena are similar; yet from both a pedagogical and an interactional standpoint, they illustrate important differences.

CLEs are susceptible to a variety of outside influences not usually found in native language (L1) conversations. By their very nature, CLEs are more highly subject to miscommunication and are more stressful for participants; thus anxiety levels of interlocutors involved in CLEs tend to escalate (cf. Krashen 1980, 1981, 1982).[2] NSs do not always function at optimum levels in CLEs, even though they are speaking their native language, because of the struggle to achieve understanding given the limitations of their NNS interlocutor(s). NNSs of advanced proficiency encounter communicative obstacles on occasion; beginning and intermediate learners often feel completely overwhelmed when trying to function in the Target Language (TL).

NSs of any language have an array of linguistic resources that can be accessed in any given situation and allow them to converse easily; these include extensive vocabularies, shared cultural information and knowledge of a broad range of language structures and styles. L2 speakers, on the other hand, necessarily control a more limited lexicon, have less shared cultural knowledge and are subject to more restrictions on style. Not only are they working to learn vocabulary and structures of the TL, but they are also trying to develop competence (for an in-depth discussion of competence, see Ch. 2) in other areas. Learners must realize the inter-relationship between the forms of a language -- phonology and syntax, and how they are used to express meaning -- semantics, (Bialystok and Hakuta 1994), as well as ascertain the function for which the structures are being used -- pragmatics (Lakoff 1990).

The language used in a given interaction is "very much dependent on a speaker's beliefs about activation states in other minds" (Chafe 1994:54). To a large extent, these beliefs are based on previous interactions, on elements within the current discourse and topics from previous talk. Others come from non-linguistic interactions, from shared experiences and from shared cultural knowledge. Varonis and Gass (1983) argue that some 'shared belief space' between interlocutors is necessary in order for an interaction to proceed smoothly (cf. Pellicer 1990).

Although each interaction is unique, prior experiences do much to foster success in current and future involvements. L2 learners with limited interactional experience who cannot hold their own in conversation oftentimes find themselves handicapped. Although they might 'know' a lot of language, they suddenly realize that *knowledge about* a language and the *ability to use* that knowledge are quite different. Indeed, many performance demands (e.g. pronunciation, grammar) are simultaneously vying for their attention, making it difficult, if not impossible (in some instances), for them to use what they know.

In addition to limited production capabilities, NNSs are further constrained cognitively by restrictions on the amount of data that can be processed at any given time.[3] Moreover, familiar patterns, or schema, which afford interlocutors the ability to anticipate what might be forthcoming, can be somewhat opaque in L2 encounters due to culturally different schemata. Although many of these patterns are transferrable from L1 to L2 discourse situations, the process is not necessarily automatic. Not only is the L2 speaker's ability to alter the nature of her/his discourse based on hearer's responses (Chafe 1994) highly challenging when attempting to function in the TL, but the L2 speaker must also expend considerable energy on interpreting utterances and on planning responses.

However, NNSs are not the only ones who encounter difficulties in CLEs. NSs must suddenly make themselves understood in new and different ways. No longer can they casually converse and expect to be understood -- oftentimes they need to plan their utterances more carefully, and they may have to repeat and/or rephrase what they say more than once. Sometimes, their efforts are for naught, and they depart the interaction without having accomplished what they had intended. Faced with such problems, many NSs become frustrated in the course of CLEs, others remain baffled at their apparent inability to communicate effectively and some try to avoid interactions with NNSs altogether.

The difficult situation of the CLE can be ameliorated when participants learn to employ communicative tactics and strategies, which are "procedures in learning, thinking, etc. which serve as a way of reaching a goal" (Richards, Platt and Platt 1992:355). Becoming tactically, then strategically, adept (de Certeau 1984), NNSs can become more successful conversational participants, more willing to venture into the arena of L2 conversation, able to create and, more importantly, to sustain their interactions.[4] Such behaviors are certainly not limited to NNSs - in fact, NSs involved in CLEs must use them as well, if they expect to function effectively in CLEs. By

learning more productive ways to navigate the obstacles they encounter in CLEs, NSs can become more efficient in their dealings with NNSs (see Sec. 1.6 below).

1.2 Who's Got the Power?

Power issues permeate human interaction. For this reason, the concept of power must be explored in the analysis of CLEs. Although it might be first assumed that NNSs would be inherently deficient in power compared with NSs, this does not always hold true. While the interactional factors mentioned above, as well as others exemplified in my data, could force NNSs into a "one-down" position that could tip the balance of power in favor of their NS interlocutors, it should be noted that power is not a static commodity that is always distributed in the same way among a group of speakers. On the contrary, power is a multi-faceted concept that is negotiable. Moreover, power has a range of manifestations, so it seems rather misleading to say that one party has it and another does not. Indeed, the very nature of conversation helps to showcase the extremely dynamic nature of power:

> Those who hold the power must constantly reassert their power...those who do not hold power are always liable to make a bid for power (Fairclough 1989:68).

Based on evidence from my data, I suggest that the ultimate success or failure of a particular interaction rests on the dynamic between interlocutors, and that this dynamic is directly related to the power structure within each CLE.

Ng and Bradac (1993) identify two types of power: 1) 'power to' - positively, the realization of personal or collective goals; negatively, the hindering of others' achievement of goals and 2) 'power over' - the relational facet of power which involves dominance and submission. Not only may both types of power be in operation simultaneously within a single CLE, but both NSs and NNSs may have access to each type of power. In addition, instead of displaying so-called 'powerful' behavior, participants sometimes achieve their interactional goals by operating more indirectly, through cooperation or support of their interlocutor (Thimm, Rademacher and Kruse 1995; cf. de Certeau 1984).

In their discussion of 'interactional power,' Thimm et al. (1995) argue that isolated utterances cannot be analyzed -- prior and subsequent moves must be considered in order to classify a particular behavior as powerful or not. In their words, "a claim for power remains merely a claim unless it is ratified by the other person" (p. 384). Moreover, what characterizes power-*full* or power-*less* discourse is often not readily apparent. In reality, some speech characteristics normally labelled as powerless can be used to gain or sustain power; also, varying circumstances can bestow the powerless with the ability to employ tactics traditionally reserved for the powerful (Tannen 1987a; cf. de Certeau 1984). Thus emerges the so-

called 'power of the weak,' who must "continually turn to their own ends forces alien to them" (de Certeau 1984:xix). In CLEs, this could certainly apply to NNSs who are "dwelling in a language" (de Certeau 1984) not their own. With tactical maneuvers, NNSs can experience at least a fleeting if not full-fledged opportunity to re-gain at least some measure of control, of themselves, as well as the task.

de Certeau discriminates between strategy and tactic, defining strategy as "the calculation (or manipulation) of power relationships that become possible as soon as a subject with will and power can be isolated" (1984:35-36); thus strategic moves are here associated with the kind of power afforded to NSs. He labels a tactic as "an art of the weak" (p. 37) that "insinuates itself into the other's place fragmentarily" (p. xix), watching for opportunities to be seized and manipulating events to create those opportunities. His notion of tactic applies easily to CLEs where NNSs are trying to "make do" (p. 29) with their less than adequate abilities in situations that are at best uncomfortable and can, at other times, be truly awful experiences. Tactics, then, afford NNSs "ways of operating," (p. xix) which can be seen as "victories of the weak over the strong" (ibid.). Complicating the L2 interactional picture even further is the process of face-maintenance, which is discussed in the next section.

1.3 Face to Face

Inherent in the operation of power in human interaction is 'face' (Brown & Levinson 1987; Goffman 1967; Scollon and Scollon 1983), which is fundamental to Conversation Analysis (CA) and especially relevant to the study of CLEs. Negative face involves the desire to be unimpeded in one's actions, while positive face is the desire for approval. In conversation, interlocutors concurrently have certain interactional goals as well as an over-riding need for approval. The resulting "mutual vulnerability of face" (Brown and Levinson 1987:61) encourages most people to cooperate with each other in interaction.[5]

Because people tend to defend their own face when threatened, it is usually to everyone's advantage to maintain the others' face. When Face-Threatening Actions (FTAs) do occur in conversation, NSs typically employ Face-Saving Actions (FSAs) as "habitual and standardized practices" (Goffman 1967:13) for counteracting such incidents.[6] These behaviors are a part of their communicative repertoire which they can use to extricate themselves from face-threatening situations.

Face-maintenance is much more challenging in CLEs. Additional effort on both sides is needed to accomplish almost every aspect of an L2 conversation, and managing to maintain face in the process is an added burden.

Incomplete grammatical competence (see Ch. 2 for further discussion of competence) is inherently face-threatening to NNSs as it can render them incapable of conveying their exact thoughts and can contribute to misunderstanding. Thus, NNSs may appear to NSs as bumbling and ignorant. The inability of learners to communicate their intentions can frustrate their NS partners, especially those unaccustomed to dealing with NNSs of limited proficiency. NSs may come across as abrupt, impatient or uncooperative, thereby creating a more face-threatening atmosphere than would otherwise be intended.

Navigation of communicative obstacles can be threatening to both parties. Any comment by NSs on an incorrect linguistic form can be construed as face-threatening to the NNS who must rely on tactics until they learn more effective strategies for repairing their utterances or requesting assistance from their interlocutors, both of which are themselves FTAs. Since none of these mechanisms are typically acquired through traditional classroom instruction, it becomes imperative for learners to participate in actual discourse situations in order to learn how to cope with such predicaments and maintain their composure in CLEs. Although a certain amount of grammar is required to begin to participate in L2

interactions, it quickly becomes apparent that in CLEs, there are many more forces at work than basic grammatical knowledge.

1.4 Grammar

Traditional grammars deal with sentence structure and context-free meaning assigned to linguistic forms. Grammar has historically been seen as a static concept, a timeless mental construct that is completely predetermined and hard-wired (e.g., Chomsky 1965; Pinker 1995). Chomsky was the first to distinguish between competence and performance, i.e., the difference between what we as humans know about language and what we do when we use language. The notion of grammar as a pre-requisite for discourse has been challenged, however, in the recent argument for 'emergent' grammar (Hopper 1988; cf. Ochs, Schegloff and Thompson 1996), a temporal social process that arises out of spoken discourse. The notion of emergent grammar is particularly applicable to CLEs, given the concept of interlanguage (Selinker 1972), which is learner language that is in a constant state of flux as the L2 learner engages in the process of acquisition.

Schegloff's (1979) notion of 'syntax-for conversation' has been expanded by a growing body of researchers.[7] Their investigations offer fresh and exciting ideas regarding grammar and interaction, viewing syntax, intonation and pragmatics as inextricably linked forces and conversational

structure as "dependent on a dynamic, interactional notion of syntax" (Ono and Thompson 1995b:1). A similar connection between interaction and syntax has been acknowledged in the second language acquisition (SLA) literature as well (Hatch 1978; Sato 1985; Wagner-Gough and Hatch 1975).

In the newly-suggested relationship between grammar and discourse, it is necessary to extend the conventional notion of grammar to one in which grammar is both a *resource for* interaction and an *outcome of* interaction. This view of grammar as 'inherently interactional' (Ochs, Schegloff and Thompson 1996) embraces the notion that spoken language is "a real-time activity whose regularities are always provisional and are continually subject to negotiation, renovation and abandonment" (Hopper 1988:118; cf. Ono and Thompson 1995a; Ono and Thompson 1995b; Sato 1985, 1986; Schegloff 1979). Part of what makes this theory so compelling, and so appropriate for the analysis of CLEs, is that it requires the addition of a component that was conspicuously missing from grammar's traditional scope: the centrality of interlocutors as involved observers and participants who cannot disengage themselves from the process in which they are involved (cf. Langacker 1995).

Richards et al. (1992:161) define grammar as "a description of the structure of a language and the way in

which linguistic units such as words and phrases are combined to produce the sentences in a language," and a form is considered to be acceptable, or grammatical, because it "because it follows the rules of a grammar." Extrapolating their definition, interactional grammar can be seen as the manner in which interlocutors combine utterances to produce talk in a language; the talk is considered acceptable if it follows the 'rules' of interaction (cf. Grice 1975).

Within this interactional framework, Goodwin (1996) outlines a variety of 'grammatical' activities that participants must simultaneously attend to during interaction: 1) sequential organization, a sort of grammar that governs the production of talk-in-interaction, e.g. adjacency pair[s] organization (Sacks 1992; Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974; Schegloff and Sacks 1973); 2) sentential grammar, which allows speakers to extend their own utterances or the utterances of others by adding new syntactic units (as both grammatical and pragmatic feature as discussed in Chapters 3 and 4), and 3) participation frameworks, which provide a mechanism, or grammar, for the ordering of relevant events that occur during or are part of the interaction. The features delineated above might not be classified as grammatical in a traditional sense, yet they are undeniable parts of every spoken interaction. Furthermore, they not only dovetail

nicely with traditional grammar, but are also congruent with pragmatics, which is built on the notion of language use in context and necessarily considers the roles of speakers and hearers.

1.5 Pragmatics, Conversation and Culture

Pragmatics evolved from philosophy in direct reaction to Chomsky's (1965) treatment of language as an abstract concept devoid of uses, users and functions (Levinson 1983). As newly expanded notions concerning grammar continue to gain acceptance, the blinders of 'categorical' linguistics and grammar can be removed, opening the door to acknowledgment of their relationship to the fields of pragmatics, sociolinguistics, ethnomethodology, et cetera. To revive the Chomskyan distinction, while traditional grammar is concerned with competence, pragmatics focuses on performance.

Levinson (1983) notes that, although pragmatics does not lie within the domain of competence, grammars (models of competence) cannot fail to acknowledge pragmatic information lest they find themselves incomplete, since without pragmatics they fail to account for certain lexical descriptions, and therefore leave incomplete syntax and phonology as well. He further argues for the significance of pragmatics based on the noticeable gap that exists between theories of language and what transpires during actual communication. Mey (1993) expands on Levinson's

relatively narrow definition of pragmatics as how a user's performance is manifested in language to a model of pragmatics that embraces both societal and social contexts.

Due to its intermediate position between grammar and culture, pragmatics has been referred to as the 'waste basket' of linguistics (Mey 1993; Yule 1996), a term which traditionally carries a negative connotation. However, 'waste basket' adopts a more positive tone when it is used to address the myriad occurrences in language that cannot be accounted for through traditional grammatical analysis. Indeed, sometimes, a pragmatic account was (and still is) "the only possible one" (Mey 1993:10). Yule (1996) offers several aspects covered by the field of pragmatics: 1) the study of speaker meaning, 2) the study of contextual meaning, 3) the study of how more gets communicated than is actually said, and 4) the study of the expression of relative distance between speaker and hearer or speaker and object(s) in the environment, all of which are factors to be considered in the analysis of CLEs.

Pragmatics is built on the notion of context, a dynamic environment that is "prompted by the continuous interaction of the people engaged in language use, the users of the language" (Mey 1993:10). This transcends pure linguistic description in that it affords us a much fuller and deeper account of human behavior with regards to language. In addition, pragmatics encompasses not only

understanding but also cooperation (Grice 1975) and accommodation (cf. Giles 1973 and Giles, Mulac and Bradac 1987; see Ch. 2 for an in-depth discussion of this concept with regard to CLEs; cf. Beebe and Giles 1984), commodities that necessarily require attention to language users.

In to order interact effectively, speakers and hearers are aware of (at least on some level) and tend to adhere to a system of order for the way language is used. Since conversations generally tend to operate within a collaborative framework, interactional norms form part of the "competences that ordinary speakers use and rely on in participating in everyday conversation" (Atkinson and Heritage 1984:1). Although participants do not usually think about such norms or rules when they are engaged in conversation, they unconsciously follow certain conventions so that their comments will be understood (Grice 1975).

Conversation is "the most common and, it would appear, most fundamental condition for language use or discourse" (Schegloff 1979:283; cf. Brody 1994); as such, conversation is a more or less continuous activity in which people are expected to demonstrate that they are talking to each other about the same things. Participants in conversation are required not only to construct sentences but also "to coordinate, in a meaningful fashion, their talk with the talk of others present" (Goodwin 1981:ix). Conversation is regulated by turns. Usually, only one person talks at a

time; if two people do begin speaking at once, one usually drops out.' Interlocutors tend to alternate turns at certain intervals known as Transition Relevance Places (TRPs), making for a smooth exchange of talk (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974).

The two roles in any conversation, speaker and hearer, shift many times throughout the course of an interaction. Traditionally, speaking has been considered the more active role while listening has been seen as the more passive one. In CLEs, however, hearers (both NSs and NNSs) assume a more participatory role since listening becomes "a necessary preliminary condition for comprehension" (Bublitz 1988:169). Not only must they listen closely to what is being said, but they must also comprehend the utterances and constantly "be preparing themselves to respond to what they are hearing" (Shotter 1993:51). The conversational process thus becomes more complicated in CLEs, causing interlocutors to require assistance in dealing with influences not usually present in L1 interactions.

1.6 Tactics and Strategies that Enhance Communication

In CLEs, both NSs and NNS must engage in a variety of maneuvers in order to manipulate language that they do not completely share in order to communicate. Yet they approach this task from two very different vantage points. In order to account for the difference in the approaches open to NSs and NNSs in CLEs, I have adopted de Certeau's

(1984) practice-based distinction between strategies and tactics (refer to Sec. 1.2). The application of this theory explains much about the nature of the roles in CLEs.

When engaged in discourse, NSs use a combination of strategies to take their turns in conversation, keep talk flowing, predict the end of speaker utterances and navigate interactional obstacles. These strategies allow speakers and hearers to adapt to "a variety of changing and often unexpected interpersonal conditions" (Savignon 1997:47). Strategies may assume a variety of postures: 1) lexical, i.e., may involve only single words, 2) syntactic, i.e., include multiple words or entire clauses, 3) intonational, i.e., invoke a particular tone that assigns additional meaning to the utterance; they exist on multiple levels: grammatical, pragmatic, or discourse. Tactics, which also involve many of the afore-mentioned characteristics, offer NNSs a way to facilitate L2 communication, i.e., they are a way of "making do" (de Certeau 1984:29) until L2 speakers can more fully develop their strategic competence . The ensuing sections will delineate a variety of these tactics and strategies (some of which assume both grammatical and pragmatic functions) that interlocutors in CLEs can use to sustain and facilitate their interactions.

1.6.1 Accommodation

In CLEs, through the use of accommodation, both NSs and NNSs can achieve their interactional goals. The term

accommodation was first used by Giles (1973) in his development of Speech Accommodation Theory (SAT). From his study of individual accent convergence in interview situations, this notion was later re-structured as Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) by Giles et al. (1987) to include a wider range of linguistic, prosodic, and nonverbal features. Although originally designed to be applied to L1 interactions, CAT is now seen as having applications regarding SLA (Beebe 1988; Beebe and Giles 1984; Beebe and Zuengler 1983; Zuengler 1982, 1987, 1991, 1993). Some of the tactical and strategic ways in which accommodation is manifested are discussed in the upcoming sections.

1.6.2 Repetition

Repetition is "a resource, a cognitive pattern at our disposal" (Johnstone 1994a:13) that functions "didactically, playfully,[10] emotionally, expressively, ritualistically" (Johnstone 1994a:6). A multi-faceted construct, repetition can be used to accomplish a variety of communicative acts. Although it does not alter referential meaning, repetition adds new dimensions to the interaction. With the use of repetition, a speaker may signal to the hearer that there is something special about what is being repeated that merits closer attention.

Repetition can be immediate or displaced, exact or non-exact; it can be invoked by self or others and can be used to empower or disempower:

> Repetition can be used by the powerful to assert their power or it can be used by the powerless to make a bid for power or to find "an acceptable means of expressing unacceptable meanings" (Johnstone 1994a:19).

This last part fulfills an important role in CLEs where unacceptable meanings are more likely to be expressed. Most of the research on repetition has been on L1 conversation; application to CLES reveal different aspects of tactical and strategic use. As will be seen in Chapter 3, repetition can function grammatically and pragmatically and can be used by both NSs and NNSs.

1.6.3 Repair

Repair is a means by which "errors, unintended forms or misunderstandings are corrected by speakers or others during conversation" (Richards et al. 1992:314). Although comprehension problems arise from time to time in L1 encounters, they are undoubtedly a more prominent occurrence in CLEs. Hearers frequently question what has just been said, ask for clarification or offer an adjusted form. Repair, then, is a mechanism that is critical to the management of CLEs and can be seen as 'a process of negotiation' (Schwartz 1980) that plays a significant role in the joint construction of context and meaning (Philips 1992:312).[11]

Repair can be invoked by self or other(s). A repair made by a speaker is known as *self*-repair, while repair made by a hearer is called *other*-repair.[12] Research has demonstrated that there is a definite preference for self-repair (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977) -- not only does it occur more frequently than other-repair, but there are also more opportunities for it to occur.[13] Other-initiated repair tends to "locate problems of hearing or understanding" (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977:379), while self-initiated repair shows a speaker's awareness of adjustments that need to be made, changing thoughts or perceived communicative difficulties. Both types of repair occur frequently in CLEs.

1.6.3.1 Repair as error correction

A special aspect of repair that must be considered in the analysis of CLEs is that of error correction. The notion of corrective feedback (from other, more capable participants) in language learning has been studied extensively (Aljaafreh and Lantolf 1994; Brock, Crookes, Day and Long 1986; Chun, Day, Chenoweth and Luppescu 1982; Corder 1967; Day, Chenoweth, Chun and Luppescu 1984; Gaskill 1980; Lightbown and Spada 1990), but the actual value of correction in SLA is still under debate. Gass and Selinker (1994) suggest that error correction can serve to let the learner know that an utterance is deviant, but propose the following limitations: 1) corrections cannot be

made for all incorrect forms, 2) many errors may be 'errors of interpretation' of which learners may remain unaware, i.e., learners may have misunderstood an utterance without realizing it, and 3) error acknowledgement (by indicating misunderstanding) does not provide specific enough information to the learner to know where the error occurred. Regardless, error correction is a feature of CLEs although its extent, as well as its effect, vary with each interaction. Yet correction is but one manifestation of repair.

1.6.3.2 Repair as reformulation

"Repair does not merely occur in sentences; it can change their shape and composition" (Schegloff 1979:266). Thus, repair can involve more than just correcting an error; it can result in the complete transformation of an utterance. Reformulation of an utterance can occur for a variety of reasons. An accommodating speaker may re-arrange the information in subsequent turns, so that the intended meaning is clarified, or may include additional information when comprehension is not forthcoming. In addition, a NS interlocutor may alter an utterance prior to completion by opting to use a different lexical item or an alternate syntactic structure.

However, the reformulation of an utterance does not always elicit the desired response. NSs in CLEs must be especially careful in their attempts at restructuring their

comments. At times, what might appear on the surface to be a valid attempt at rephrasing an utterance may do little to foster comprehension. For example, the use of low-frequency lexical items and complex syntactic patterns by NSs can actually impede understanding. It should be stressed, however, that the gate swings both ways. Neither party can be expected to bear the entire responsibility for communicative difficulties. Either is capable of subverting the process of comprehension. Just as understanding can be negotiated, so misunderstanding is interactive and jointly constructed (de Hérédia 1986:17). So, rather than redoubling their efforts or abandoning their attempts at L2 communication altogether, interlocutors can decide to work together to achieve comprehension. The notion of collaboration to achieve comprehension embraces the ideas of Vygotsky (1978, 1986) and other Soviet researchers (cf. Luria 1981, Vološinov 1973; Wertsch 1981, 1985) who saw language development as a social process and identified a crucial link between thinking and speaking. Their work gained a following of researchers who subsumed their ideas and applied them to L2 interactions (cf. Donato 1994, Frawley and Lantolf 1985; Lantolf and Ahmed 1989, Lantolf and Appel 1988). The application of a Vygotskyan approach to CLEs is discussed

in depth in Chapter 2; examples which highlight the Soviet approach to language development are presented in Chapter 4, which adopts a Vygotskyan slant on repair in CLEs.

1.6.4 Laughter

A prominent interactional tool, laughter fulfills a multitude of interactional functions. One of its most striking features is that it is "tied in a most powerful way to the immediately prior utterance" (Schenkein 1972:365). Crucially positioned at a Transition Relevance Place (TRP), which is "a legitimate and expectable place for a recipient to respond in the course of an ongoing utterance" (Jefferson 1979:81), laughter provides a participant with the perfect opportunity to latch on to the very next turn and occupy a slot that might have been reserved for another speaker. All types of spoken interaction involve an ongoing exchange in which the next turn is a prized commodity. So interlocutors who can readily capture the next turn and claim the conversational 'floor' (Edelsky 1981) can move closer to achieving their interactional goal. Depending upon the context of a situation, laughter can be interpreted in one of two ways: 1) as a positive, uplifting addition to a conversation or 2) as an FTA which runs contrary to the desires of either speaker or hearer. Laughter can be used both tactically and strategically (de Certeau 1984) -- as an FSA or to

intensify or diminish the force of FTAs, thus confirming the necessity for considering the dynamics of an interaction when evaluating face.

The majority of the research on laughter that has been done to date has focussed on L1 conversations (Cox 1982; Glenn 1987, 1989, 1991; Hertzler 1970; Jefferson, 1979, 1985, 1994; Jefferson, Sacks and Schegloff 1987; Norrick 1989, 1993, 1994; O'Donnell-Trujillo and Adams 1983; Plummer 1991; Schenkein, 1972; Schegloff 1982). My study (cf. Stewart 1995, 1997a; Stewart 1998) analyzes various occurrences of laughter by both NSs and NNSs in an L2 setting, In the analysis of examples highlighting some of the interactional features of laughter, I discuss how facework is accomplished using laughter.

1.6.5 Summary

This section has presented a discussion of tactics and strategies that are accessible to interlocutors involved in CLEs. The main link between them all is that they entail speakers and hearers who are actually using language, as opposed to pieces of language in isolation without consideration of interlocutors. The next sections will discuss the rationale behind my investigation and describe the data collection procedures.

1.7 Rationale for My Study

The field of Discourse Analysis (DA) arises from multiple disciplines and has been described as

"disconcerting [due to] vagueness" (Hatch and Long 1980:35), "vast and ambiguous" (Schiffrin 1987b:1) and "lacking in focus and consensus" (Stubbs 1983:12). As Brown and Yule (1983) note, researchers in the area of DA often search for one true way that will explain what goes on in actual language use. Of course, this technique has not yet been developed. However, lack of a definitive procedure for the analysis of discourse has not discouraged interest, nor has it stifled the search for a conclusive explanation. On the contrary, DA is not only a fashionable area of investigation but, like pragmatics, has become more widely accepted as a valid area of linguistic study. While many would call it messy because analytical approaches to discourse are still in the developmental stages, others would call it "rich." Despite characteristics discomfitting to some, DA is a thriving domain, specifically because it offers us such a wealth of information about language and its users.

Those engaged in discourse: 1) create and search for structures, 2) convey meanings and 3) accomplish actions, activities which are not autonomous but are uniquely intertwined. The most prominent structural feature of discourse is its dialogic nature, i.e. speakers perform both linguistic and social acts as they take their turns in speech (Merritt 1974; cf. Vygotsky 1986). Participation in actual discourse situations has been shown to be important

for NNSs in the development of later oral fluency (Horowitz 1986; Hatch 1992), and pairings between NSs and NNSs in a variety of settings can expand the communicative resources of learners (cf. Berry-Bravo 1993; Faerch and Kasper 1980; Gumperz 1990; Hatch 1983, Long 1981; Salamone and Marsal 1997).

Interaction is the "universally common medium for language acquisition, language maintenance and language change" (Ochs, Schegloff and Thompson 1996:37). Although to date no conclusive evidence has been presented to warrant claims that interaction causes SLA, it certainly cannot be disputed that acquisition will not occur without interaction. In order to better understand the acquisition process, we need to analyze texts that arise from L2 discourse situations because they contain much information about the nature of learning. Those that involve negotiation and the use of tactics and strategies are even more beneficial as they reveal 1) how learners receive unfamiliar L2 input and how they respond to feedback on their L2 production, 2) what role NSs play in facilitating these processes and in providing learners with information of L2 rules and features (Pica 1992a), and 3) how the complex nature of power is complicated in CLEs (de Certeau 1984). In addition, negotiation links social processes (signalling and response moves) with linguistic processes (repetition, reformulation and other lexical and syntactic

adjustments) and cognitive processes (attention and comprehension), all of which contribute to the L2 learning process (Pica 1992c:439), thus inviting a further application of Vygotsky's and de Certeau's theories to CLEs.

1.8 Data for My Study

Although often disorderly, full of stops, starts and hesitations, and tedious to transcribe and analyze, authentic interactional data offer insight into the processes involved in SLA (Hatch 1978; Ochs, Schegloff and Thompson 1996; Preston 1989). My data comprise two distinct types of interactions: 1) a simulated service encounter involving dyads of NSs and NNSs of Spanish (Situation #1) and 2) a free conversation between an advanced NNS of Spanish and several NSs of Spanish which took place in the Dominican Republic during the Summer of 1991 (Situation #2).

A service encounter is defined as a face-to-face interaction between a server and a customer "oriented to the satisfaction of the customer's presumed desire for some service and the server's obligation to provide that service" (Merritt 1976:321). Simulation was chosen because it provides speakers with the opportunity to interact in a potentially real-world event and creates "an actual, current reality in and of itself" (Oxford 1997:449; cf. Kasper & Dahl 1991; Tarone 1978; Tarone & Yule 1989; Yule &

Powers 1994). Although roles and goals of simulated interactions are task-constrained, elicitation of actual talk with its requirements of turn-taking and unplanned responses affords us insights into ways that speakers react to the communicative difficulties they face during interaction (Yule & Powers 1994).

As Nofsinger (1991:50) reminds us, "conversation is not merely a collection of actions - it is a process of interaction," which unfolds in real time and involves two or more people. The free conversation analyzed in this study stands in stark contrast to the service encounters in a number of areas: 1) it involves five people; 2) the NNS is of advanced proficiency; and 3) the discourse contains no restriction on topic and includes a much broader range of utterances. Thus, some interesting comparisons may be drawn between the two situations.

1.8.1 Situation #1: A Simulated Service Encounter

1.8.1.1 The Task

An open role-play task was designed to produce a negotiated interaction between two speakers.[14] The situation provided roles of hairstylist and customer for each pair of participants; the goal of the interaction was to make an hour-long appointment for a haircut. Schedules for both parties were designed to be in conflict, so participants had to negotiate a solution that required concessions from one or both parties. The study of

negotiated interaction can provide "understanding and appreciation of what both learners and interlocutors contribute to the SLA process" (Pica, Holliday, Lewis and Morganthaler 1989:84; cf. Brooks, Donato and McGlone 1996; Doughty and Pica 1986; Kasper & Dahl 1991; Takahashi 1998; Tarone 1978; Tarone & Yule 1989; Yule & Powers 1994).

1.8.1.2 Participants

NSs of Spanish were taking English classes through a university-sponsored English Language & Orientation Program. Native Spanish speakers were enlisted with the help of a variety of university personnel.[15] Volunteers were told that they would be speaking in Spanish with students of Spanish as part of my research project. NNS volunteers (all native English speakers) were enrolled in beginning and intermediate university-level Spanish classes during the summers of 1993 (Situation 1a)[16] and 1998 (Situation 1b). Students were told that the project involved research on the development of learners' spoken ability in Spanish. They understood that they would spend a few minutes interacting with NSs of Spanish, that prior experience in talking with a NS was not a pre-requisite, and that it did not matter whether they thought they could complete the task or not -- the important thing was that they made the attempt.

Those who were willing to take part provided names, phone numbers (and e-mail addresses when available). We

made arrangements for a suitable time for taping at a later date. Pairs of NSs and NNSs were established based on their availability. At the appointed time, participants met with the researcher(s), who explained the upcoming task and assured them of confidentiality (see consent form in Appendix A). Each person received information in her/his L1 concerning the specifics of the task (see Appendix B). Interactions were audiotaped; participants were alone during the actual taping.

1.8.1.3 Questionnaire

Speakers in Situation #1b were asked to complete a brief questionnaire regarding their attitudes about studying Spanish and their previous L2 interactional experience.[17]

1.8.1.3.1 Instructions

Please answer the questions using the scale below. Feel free to elaborate out to the side of any/all questions.

1.8.1.3.2 Rating Scale

1	never	strongly disagree
2	rarely	somewhat disagree
3	occasionally	neither agree or disagree
4	fairly often	somewhat agree
5	regularly	strongly agree

TABLE 1. Attitude Questionnaire

No.	Question
1	I enjoy taking Spanish.
2	I look forward to taking future Spanish classes.
3	I think that foreign language study is part of a well-rounded education.
4	I like speaking Spanish in class.
5	I prefer studying grammar.
6	Even if I am well-prepared for class, I feel anxious.
7	I look for opportunities to speak Spanish outside of class.
8	I read newspapers and/or magazines in Spanish.
9	I watch TV/movies in Spanish.
10	I am interested in Hispanic culture, history or literature.
11	I have taken advantage of conversation hours offered by the Spanish Club at the university.
12	I have worked around a lot of Spanish-speaking people.
13	I have travelled to a Spanish-speaking country.
14	I want to travel to a Spanish-speaking country so that I can practice my Spanish and see how well I do.
15	I have lived in a Spanish-speaking country.
16	I studied Spanish in high school.
17	I studied another foreign language in high school.
18	The ONLY reason I am taking Spanish now is to meet a degree requirement.
19	I think that knowing Spanish might be helpful in my future employment.
20	I found this speaking task to be an enjoyable experience.
21	This was the first time I had ever attempted to carry on a sustained interaction with a native speaker other than with my instructor(s) or in the conversation labs that are a part of my class.

1.8.2 Situation #2 - A Free Conversation

I was one of ten students chosen to participate in a living-abroad experience in the Dominican Republic during the summer of 1991.[18] I lived for thirty days in Santiago, a city in the northern part of the country. Coming from a strong background of Mexican Spanish, I was exposed to a Caribbean dialect of Spanish for the first time and was afforded the opportunity to expand my knowledge of both language and culture. My sociolinguistics professor[19] suggested that I take a tape recorder with me and that I turn it on whenever possible. Since my host family raised no objections to being taped, I brought it out from time to time during informal family gatherings. I had no idea what the tapes would reveal or that their contents might be used for later research.

1.8.2.1 The Interaction

The conversation is a particularly lively interchange that took place in my host family's home one day before lunch. It began in the kitchen with talk about cooking and expanded into the living area to include the watching of a Spanish soap opera and the telling of a story by the NNS.[20]

1.8.2.2 Participants

Native Spanish-speakers were members of my host family and include the mother (NSM) and father (NSJM), two daughters ages 14 years (NSMon) and 10 years (NSCl); their

17 year old son was present but did not speak. In this situation, I was the NNS, an L1 speaker of English, and an advanced (see Appendix C) L2 speaker of Spanish.

1.9 Transcription of Data

Detailed transcription of each interaction are located in Appendix E. The following symbols are used in transcription of the data:

TABLE 2. Transcription Conventions

Symbol	Description
[	Speech overlap
=	Latching
. , ?	Transitional continuity Final Continuing Appeal
...(N) :	Duration Pause Lengthened segment
(( )) ???	Transcriber's perspective Researcher's comments Unintelligible speech
' << >> CAPS _____	Specialized notations Accented syllable High pitched voice Loud voice Singing voice
@@@@	Noises Laughter

1.10 Summary and Schema of Forthcoming Chapters

The preceding discussion highlights only a few of many factors to be considered in the analysis of L2 discourse and suggests some of the complexities of CLEs. Chapter 2

offers a review of pertinent literature. The analysis chapters (3-5) illustrate the interface between grammar and pragmatics. A division between the two is rather artificial since they are closely linked and at times hard to distinguish. Indeed the two operate concurrently and are mutually reinforcing. Moreover, certain tactics and strategies function both grammatically and pragmatically, so they will be presented and discussed in context. Chapter 3 is devoted to repetition and its crucial position in the emergence of L2 discourse. Chapter 4 adopts a Vygotskyan posture on repair, both as error correction and as reformulation. Examples illustrate how learners' utterances can span the entire spectrum of regulation (object- through self-) within the course of a single interaction. Chapter 5 focusses on laughter and its various interactional uses. Chapter 6 presents a revised perspective on CLEs based on the novel theoretical approaches applied, a synthesis of the grammar/pragmatic interface, pedagogical implications and recommendations for further research.

1.11 End Notes

1. Paikeday (1985) challenges the entire notion of native speaker; Levine (1997) also takes issue with the term. Appel and Lantolf (1994) argue that L2 performance hinges on the interaction of individual and task, not on an individual's membership in "some a priori category, such as native or non-native speaker" (p. 437). Rampton (1990a) suggests alternative terms such as expertise, inheritance and affiliation. Vasseur, Broeder and Roberts (1996) use the terms 'majority and 'minority' speakers. Savignon (1997:230) suggests that the most significant difference

between the NS and the NNS "may well be that the latter is often tested for a competence that the former is assumed to have." See also Coulmas (1981), which is a festschrift for NSs. The term NS is used in this dissertation only as a practical means of distinguishing speakers who have Spanish as their first language from students who are studying Spanish as a foreign language.

2. See Krashen's (1981) discussion of the affective filter, which measures an individual's anxiety level with regards to L2 performance.

3. See Chafe (1994) for an in-depth discussion of cognitive restrictions.

4. For a further discussion of willingness to communicate, see McIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei and Noels (1998).

5. Penman (1990) challenges the notion of cooperation with regard to facework (cf. Craig, Tracy and Spisak 1986; Penman 1987).

6. Like schema (refer to Sec. 1.1), FSAs are sometimes transferable from L1 to L2 discourse situations, but again the process is not necessarily automatic. In addition, since face-saving practices differ between cultures, a speaker must interact with speakers of the TL in order to know whether such a transfer would be appropriate. It is outside the scope of this document to address any cultural differences with regard to face.

7. See e.g., Chafe 1987, 1994; Ferrara 1992; Ford 1993; Ford and Thompson 1996; Goodwin 1981; Langacker 1987, 1995; Lerner 1991; Ono and Thompson 1995a, 1995b.

8. Adjacency pair is defined as a sequence of communicative actions which tend to occur adjacent to each other. These actions, which are sequentially organized, are produced by different speakers and contain a first pair part and a second pair part (Nofsinger 1991; cf. Schegloff and Sacks 1973).

9. This is somewhat less applicable to Spanish-language conversations where "overlaps are the norm...and are considered signs of interest, spontaneity, of wanting to make the speaker see that the hearer is with him or her" (Klee 1998:344; cf. Tannen 1984).

10. This is an aspect of repetition that is often neglected.

11. It should be noted, however, that who acknowledges the problem, who makes the repair and the manner in which the repair is made can have an effect on the outcome of the interaction.

12. These terms refer to the actual process of repair, not to the outcome of the process (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977).

13. This may not hold true for CLEs. especially those involving NNSs of lower proficiency.

14. Thanks to George Yule for his assistance in designing the task used for Situation #1a (Stewart and Pearson 1995). The same task was used in Situation #1b.

15. My sincere appreciation goes to Professor José Luis Montiel, Director of the Language Laboratory at LSU, to ELOP directors and teachers, and to Héctor and Plinio González for their invaluable assistance in helping me to locate NSs for this project.

16. Thanks to Lynn Pearson for allowing me to use some of the data from Stewart and Pearson (1995).

17. See Appendix D for compilation of the results.

18. Funding for this trip was provided in large part by the Jordan Institute at Texas A&M University.

19. I am deeply grateful to Dr. Kathleen Ferrara of the Texas A&M University Department of English for having made this suggestion. If not for her wise counsel, I would not have collected the data for analysis.

20. I am indebted to Jacqueline Girón and Marta Ruíz-García for their assistance in the transcription of the Dominican conversation.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 The Nature of Language Teaching

Being able to speak another language is the dream of many foreign language students. How many times have we heard people say -- "I studied language X for Y years and never was able to carry on a conversation"? Although multitudes of institutions have jumped aboard the bandwagon of communicative language teaching (cf. Terrell, Andrade, Egasse and Muñoz 1994), not a lot has changed either in the classroom or in terms of results. Although various theories of language learning and teaching have been proposed over the years, students continue to complete several semesters of language study without being able to put together more than a couple of sentences, oftentimes with great difficulty. Alas, the best way to propel students to an autonomous state in language use has yet to be revealed:

> This is the critical point in our teaching. Until we have solved this problem we will continue to mark time, developing more and more efficient techniques for producing second language cripples, with all the necessary muscles and sinews but unable to operate on their own...The goal seems still to elude us (Rivers 1983:42).

During the last decade, the use of textbooks that employ a communicative approach to language teaching[1] has become the norm rather than the exception.[2] This approach, which Savignon refers to as "a *philosophy* of language rather than a method of teaching" (1997:29; cf. Savignon 1990), shies away from traditional grammar-based teaching as it recognizes that language use is governed by sociolinguistic and discourse principles, as well as by phonological and grammatical rules, and focuses on the development of a learner's ability to use 'everyday' language to communicate ideas and feelings. Learners are told not to worry about making mistakes and are encouraged to concentrate on getting the main idea; they are not expected to comprehend every single word.

The idea is to emulate what might occur if the student were exposed to the language in a more naturalistic setting than the traditional classroom has been able to provide. While many of the notions espoused in the communicative approach have merit, some serious flaws remain. Two of the most glaring are that many classroom teachers are not properly trained in using such an approach[3] and that testing of actual communicative ability has largely failed to become a reality. Communicative testing would include contextualized, open-ended questions that allow students to display what they do know as opposed to traditional, closed questions that show what they do *not* know. Thus, the focus

on grammar persists (cf. Brody 1998; Lafayette 1988, 1998) and much of a learner's ability to demonstrate what has been learned is often, although not always, assessed in a decontextualized manner.

2.2 The Role of Grammar in Foreign Language Instruction

Grammar has played a variety of roles in the language teaching arena. Grammar instruction has traditionally been the required component of every language teaching program. In fact, until the 19th century, "the teaching of language and the study of grammar were practically synonymous" (Rutherford and Sharwood-Smith 1988:9). Ever since the abandonment of the Grammar-Translation Method in the late 1950s, in which grammar was the central focus, the exact place that grammar should occupy in language classrooms has been called into question, and the appropriate place for grammar in the classroom has puzzled language teachers ever since.'

This 'great grammar debate' (Blyth 1998) has caused grammar to remain on a pendulum through the Direct Method (de-emphasized), through Situational Language Teaching (SLT) in Britain and the Audiolingual Method (ALM) in the United States. In both SLT and ALM, grammar was emphasized, but it was taught by embedding it in dialogue and pattern drills. With the decline of ALM in the United States, a whole array of new methods emerged including the Silent Way (Gattegno 1972), Suggestopedia (Lozanov 1982),

Total Physical Response (TPR) (Asher 1982) and Community Language Learning (Curran 1976), each with its own view of grammar's required capacity. More recently, the Natural Approach and Communicative Language Teaching, both of which incorporate TPR, have relegated grammar once again to the back seat, since their main goal is fluency as opposed to accuracy (Krashen and Terrell 1983).

Although students of Communicative Language Teaching and the Natural Approach became more communicative, some research has labelled them 'grammatically incompetent' and demonstrated the need for grammar to resume a prominent position in L2 instruction. Higgs and Clifford (1982) harshly criticized the communicative approach, yet did recognize that language students have varying goals and conceded that grammar skills for those who are merely seeking survival skills would be very different from the needs of students who are seeking to become both fluent and accurate. Krashen and Terrell see the role of grammar as "limited...and restricted to situations where it will not interfere with communication" (1983:57); however, they agree that, in certain programs, advanced grammar does have a place, especially for those who are interested in studying it, "perhaps future linguists and language teachers" (p. 57). In the final analysis however, it should be recognized that each language learning experience is unique:

> The final factor to consider is the learner's need: what will the learner have to be able to do in [English] the TL? If the learner's immediate goal is survival communication, formal accuracy is of negligible value; on the other hand, if the learner wants to function as an academic, a diplomat, or a business executive, then a high degree of formal accuracy is required (Celce-Murcia 1985:2; cf. Tarone and Yule 1989).[5]

The above argument notwithstanding, grammar was again emphasized, and the proficiency-based approach to language teaching emerged (Omaggio 1983). Proficiency focuses on what the student can do and how well s/he can do it and concerns itself with the development of linguistic accuracy from the onset. The *what* refers to topic or context and function, while the *how well* looks at linguistic precision. This approach, which aligns itself closely with the ACTFL (1986) guidelines (Appendix C) for the development of proficiency in the four skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing), embraces the tenet that lexical and grammatical errors present the greatest impediments to communication and advocates some sort of error correction immediately.

To deal with the issue of grammatical proficiency, the notion of grammatical consciousness-raising (C-R) became favored in some camps. C-R, a type of focussed grammar instruction, is accomplished by using language learning tasks that encourage communication about grammar (cf. Herschensohn 1990; Hendrickson 1991, 1992; Rivers 1987b).

This approach is somewhat more contextualized and often task-based (Melles 1997; Rutherford 1987, Rutherford and Sharwood-Smith 1985, 1988; Schmidt 1990; Sharwood-Smith 1988; cf. Fotos and Ellis 1991; Long 1989; Nunan 1989).

C-R supporters acknowledge the fact that learning, to be meaningful, must take place within some context and must be related to something already known. They contend that students who are involved in L2 learning have already gone through the process of acquiring an L1. Thus, they already have knowledge of 'how' language is learned and used. What they don't know is how the TL processes are similar (or not) to those in their L1. C-R would be a valuable aid in their journey from 'familiar' (L1) to 'unfamiliar' (L2); thus it assumes a facilitator posture.[6] (Similarities to the Vygotskyan approach will become apparent in Sec. 2.4).

Drawing on universal principles and processes of language learning to support their theory, C-R proponents contend that some focus on form is essential to the adequate learning of an L2 and believe 1) that language learners' expectations of at least some attention to form (Krashen 1982) should be met, 2) that a combination of form-focused and function-focused activities make for a more well-rounded and beneficial learning experience and 3) that classroom instruction that includes some form-focused

activity provides the opportunity for learners to test hypotheses about the TL (Donato and Adair-Hauck 1992; Loschky and Bley-Vroman 1990).[7]

The varied approaches to teaching grammar mentioned above can be seen to represent a continuum ranging from those where grammar instruction has a minimal effect on L2 acquisition (Krashen 1985; Seliger 1983), to those where conscious grammar teaching and learning should be de-emphasized (Horowitz 1986) and to those where it is considered essential that learners obtain the necessary data they need to acquire particular grammatical forms (White 1987). Apparently, the opposing camps are not destined to be in agreement:

> Much of the effort spent arguing against the teaching of grammar might be better spent on convincing true believers in grammar instruction that grammar has a newly-defined but useful role to play in language teaching and in showing them what it is (Krahnke 1985:598).

Celce-Murcia (1985:5) makes the following suggestions regarding the teaching of grammar in the classroom: 1) integrate form, meaning and content; 2) be selective in correcting errors; 3) use activities that raise students' consciousness about grammar as needed; 4) foster the development of strategies that encourage students to notice their own errors and promote self-correction; and 5) answer students' questions about grammar. These ideas are not only sensible, but viable in the majority of FL classrooms

of today, and they seem quite compatible with a communicative approach, even moreso in classrooms where interaction is a priority.

Meaningful tasks and role plays in which students use the L2 are essential components of an L2 classroom if learners are ever going to develop speaking skills. Activities can be designed in such a way that grammar structures are practiced in context. Providing a safe and secure environment in which to practice speaking will allow students to test their knowledge without feeling threatened. Errors can be addressed without making the students feel incompetent or afraid of uttering the next word. Teaching students appropriate tactics for navigating communicative obstacles can give them additional confidence when engaged in L2 speaking. However, all of these suggestions for a communicative classroom go against the grain of the traditional, teacher-centered classroom. Fortunately, the environment is evolving, albeit as a very slow, and sometimes painful, process.

2.3 The Evolving Classroom Environment

With the advent of the communicative approach there has been a movement towards the establishment of less traditional classroom environments. Along with the less-conventional comes the realization that a 'classroom culture' exists (cf. Brody 1998) in which students become involved as active participants inside the classroom. This

classroom culture, although akin to real-world culture in certain aspects, has a distinct character of its own due to a number of factors including, but certainly not limited to, the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of the students in a particular group.

There are a number of differences that exist between classroom language situations and real-life language situations. Chastain (1987) identifies several features that are characteristic of 'real' language as opposed to the rather artificial language of the classroom: 1) language arises from some emotional, cognitive and/or physical state of the speaker, 2) the speaker is able to generate language because s/he has the knowledge and the competence, 3) the focus is normally on meaning, not grammar, 4) the communication is directed to someone, and 5) language has a purpose. However synthetic the language of the classroom may be, it certainly exhibits many of the above-mentioned characteristics (most especially in a communicative classroom environment), and this language forms a crucial part of the learners' knowledge base. Later, if and when students take this knowledge and attempt to communicate with NSs of the TL, classroom interaction will have provided a starting point, and interactions with NSs will further the development of the communicative and cultural aspects of students' overall L2 ability. Note the distinction between second language and foreign language

classrooms -- the former existing within the culture where the TL is spoken, the latter occurring in a 'foreign' environment where students may or may not have access to NSs of the TL (and may or may not avail themselves of opportunities outside the classroom). Thus, the 'classroom cultures' of L2 and FL classrooms would naturally be quite different.

2.3.1 Cooperative Learning

One of the alternatives to the traditional classroom stems from the movement of cooperative learning (for L1, see Olsen and Kagan 1992; for L2, see McGroarty 1993 and Dörnyei 1997), in which activities are organized in such a way that "learning is dependent on the socially structured exchange of information between learners in groups" (Olsen and Kagen 1992:8; *cf.* discussion of Vygotsky in Sec. 2.4). Advantages of cooperative learning are that it increases motivation and self-esteem, lowers anxiety and helps develop higher order thinking skills (Oxford 1997). While this type of endeavor acknowledges the social aspect of language use, it has not been effective with all types of learners. Moreover, it is often highly organized (for both teachers and students) and has specific aims (rather than being open-ended). Cooperative learning, then, contains the potential to stifle learners' creativity, an essential aspect of the L1 language acquisition process and crucial to the development of L2 interlanguage. Interlanguage

(Selinker 1972; cf. Ellis 1985) is language produced by L2 speakers who are engaged in the learning process; the language differs from the mother tongue and the TL and is sometimes referred to as an *approximative system* (Richards et al. 1992:186). Because learners are in process, the state of their interlanguage is constantly evolving, that is, it is "forever becoming something else" (Rutherford 1987:38).

2.3.2 Collaborative Learning

Although similar to cooperative learning, collaborative learning is distinct in that it embraces many of the ideas of John Dewey, an American social constructivist philosopher. Collaborative learning, which proceeds from functional-notional teaching and proficiency-based instruction (Oxford 1997), also recognizes the importance of the social environment and the power of individuals working together (for L1 learning, see Vygotsky 1978, 1986; for L2 learning, see Aljaafreh and Lantolf 1994; Di Pietro 1987, Donato 1994, Frawley and Lantolf 1985, Johnson 1989; Lantolf and Ahmed 1989, Lantolf and Appel 1988, Moll 1989; Nyikos and Hashimoto 1997, Schinke-Llano 1993). Collaborative learning encourages students' participation in speaking activities in settings other than the classroom (e.g. talking with each other outside of class and with NSs).

Contrasted with cooperative learning, collaborative L2 learning is less prescriptive and more student-centered. Learning occurs within a specific social context and learners benefit from the knowledge of others in the group:

> Cultural and linguistic ideas are best shaped through reflective inquiry with others people (teachers, peers, native speakers, etc.) who help the learner negotiate his or her ... degree of potential under the best conditions (Oxford 1997:448).

Collaborative learning requires teachers to assume a variety of roles: guides, facilitators and resources, as well as language experts. Unfortunately, few teachers really teach collaboratively because they are ill-prepared due to lack of interaction both in their own L2 learning experience and in their training. Education programs have only recently begun to offer training in the collaborative learning method.[8]

Donato and Adair-Hauck (1992) offer recommendations for collaboration within the classroom using the concept of proleptic instruction, which invokes an expert (teacher) to guide the novice (learner) through the process of acquisition of [grammatical] knowledge (cf. Vygotsky 1986). Prolepsis, a 'powerful kind of instruction that serves to invigorate learning' (Stone 1991, cited in Donato and Adair-Hauck, 1992:83), focuses on negotiation between teacher and student(s) in dialogue with one another in a

social context. Moving away from a teacher-centered classroom, this approach makes students more responsible for their own learning.

The different approaches to teaching and learning discussed above have highlighted the swing of the theoretical pendulum from an intense concentration on grammar to a much more subdued role for grammar. Unquestionably, some grammatical knowledge is requisite for beginning to speak another language:

> *El desarrollo de la competencia comunicativa por parte de los estudiantes de español no puede realizarse sin atender al componente gramatical (Melles 1997:848).*
>
> The development of communicative competence by students of Spanish cannot be realized without attention to the grammatical component (my translation).

Seemingly, however, moderation would be the appropriate watchword. With a modicum of grammatical knowledge, students should be able to begin the journey toward L2 proficiency, with their interlanguage and tactical abilities developing in the process.

2.3.3 Interaction

The role of interaction as a means of attaining competence in a second language (L2) is a recurrent topic in the SLA literature. Krashen's (1981, 1982) input hypothesis, which identified comprehensible input as a prerequisite for SLA, Long's (1980, 1981, 1983) claim about

the essential nature of negotiation via linguistic and conversational modifications and Swain's (1985) argument for comprehensible *output* all supported Hatch's (1978) contention that analysis of discourse between NS and NNSs is the key to understanding SLA. Since then, a multitude of other studies have been undertaken to look at the effects of interaction (both between learners and NSs and between learners and other learners) on SLA both in and out of the classroom (Brooks 1992a, Brooks 1992b, Brooks 1992c; Di Pietro 1987; Gaies 1982; Gass, Mackey and Pica 1998; Gass and Varonis 1985, 1994; Long 1981, 1983, 1995; Pica, Young and Doughty 1987; Pica 1986, 1987, 1992a, 1992b, 1994, 1996; Porter 1986; Sato 1986; Swain and Lapkin 1998; Varonis and Gass 1985).

Interactive language teaching (Rivers 1987a) and learning, which involves actual communication between two or more persons, is congruent with both cooperative and collaborative learning-based teaching methods. In the L2 classroom, interactive teaching "focuses on creating communicative situations that enable students to convey and receive authentic messages containing information that appeals to both sender and receiver" (Ramírez 1995:17). Interaction would ensue from exercises such as games, role-play, or 'role enactment' (Di Pietro 1990) activities and electronic exercises', all of which are designed to stimulate students' creative abilities. Advantages of

interaction between L2 learners include physical and emotional safety, lack of real-life pressure, the low cost of making an error, generation of much authentic language, increased student motivation and interest (Oxford 1997). Disadvantages might include anxiety on the part of some students, varied responses due to different learner styles, and conflict with learners' expectations of a more grammar-based approach to language teaching, all of which might contribute to initial resistance to interaction. Although at first students might balk at this 'different' way of doing things, they should be able to transcend some of their fears as they actually begin to speak the L2, which is what they have wanted to do all along.

Another interactional approach to language teaching is strategic interaction (Di Pietro 1987), which is based on scenarios that call upon learners "to invoke the target language (TL) purposefully and artfully in dealing with others" (p. vii). In the context of strategic interaction, students are given the opportunity to exercise more control over their own learning process, and through being users of the language, they become learners of it. Scenarios place students in a particular situation that allows them "to fulfill personal agendas within a shared context" (ibid., p. 41).

In a similar vein, Hatch, Flashner and Hunt (1986) propose an experience model of L2 language teaching that

calls for students to be directly involved in the learning process as they are engaged in using the L2. This hands-on approach, which sees learning as a social experience that necessarily involves other human beings, highlights the interconnectedness of the social, cognitive and linguistic facets of an L2 learner's system:

> Just as the interpretation of experience 'evolves from the developing communication system, so the total communication system must evolve from the interpretation of our experiences for ourselves and each other (p. 17).

These ideas certainly seem congruent with those of interactional grammar (refer to Sec. 1.4).

Gass and Selinker (1994) offer an interactive model of SLA that includes the following stages: 1) "apperceived input, which they define as those 'noticed' characteristics of the L2 that learners can relate to past experiences -- involves cognitive processes influenced by frequency, affect, prior knowledge and attention; 2) comprehended input, which is learner-controlled (as opposed to comprehensible input which is other-controlled); 3) intake, which is the process of "assimilating linguistic material" (p. 302) -- involves psycholinguistic processes and hypothesis testing; 4) integration, including grammar development and storage of knowledge which is not an isolated incident and may be inconsistently reflected in L2 use; and 5) output, which "represents more than the learner's knowledge of language -- it is an active part of

the entire learning process" (p. 307). None of these stages is absolute, and all will necessarily be revisited on multiple occasions during the acquisition process, the frequency depending upon the particular situation and the interlocutors involved (cf. Vygotsky's notion of the principle of continuous access discussed in Sec. 2.4 below).

In conclusion, although interaction is the preferred arena for language acquisition, whether interaction actually promotes SLA remains questionable (cf. Gass, Mackey and Pica 1998). While many would argue that it does (Long 1981; Krashen 1982; Hatch 1983; Rutherford 1987; Swain 1985), no conclusive evidence has yet been presented. However, anyone who has ever made the attempt to learn another language would not dispute the fact that practice is a great (if not the greatest) teacher. Learners must participate in their own learning process; failure to do so will result in incomplete knowledge. Unfortunately, it is precisely the interactive facet of second language (L2) learning that is most often neglected in a classroom environment:

> What is lacking, more often than not however, is classroom opportunity for the learner to speak in a social context where substantive communication takes place -- where learners have a personal investment in the substance of the conversation and where meaning is 'negotiated' through the give and take of verbal exchange (Rutherford 1987:173).

Many of the so-called 'communicative' activities do little more than "provide useful practice for the manipulation of linguistic forms" (Savignon 1997:30). While this pseudo-communicative focus on form in itself is not harmful, much more meaningful learning can be derived from having learners engage in contextualized speaking activities that are representative of possible real-world experiences, ultimately with NSs of the TL.[10] An interactive approach to language teaching and learning which takes both thinking and speaking into account fits well within a Vygotskyan framework, which is explored in the next section.

2.4 A Vygotskyan Perspective

Many of the works cited above in relation to cooperative, collaborative and interactive learning have their orientation in Vygotskyan theory. Vygotsky's work (1934 [1962], 1978, 1986) and that of his disciples (Luria 1981; Wertsch 1981, 1985) can contribute significantly to a better understanding of CLEs, where linguistic and social acts are so closely entwined. The focus of the Vygotskyan approach is the social nature of human interaction, a point which has also been emphasized in some theories of L2 learning discussed above. Although controversial when first proposed, many of the ideas espoused by these Soviet researchers are now being embraced by those involved in L2 teaching and research (Ahmed 1994; Brooks & Donato 1994; Di Pietro 1987; Hatch 1983, 1992; Frawley & Lantolf 1985;

O'Malley and Chamot 1990; Lantolf and Ahmed 1989; Lantolf and Appel 1994; Lantolf and Dicamila 1983; Lantolf and Frawley 1983; Pica, Doughty and Young 1986; Schinke-Llano 1995).

The work of Vygotsky and his associates challenged prior theories of language development in general. Learning and development were no longer seen as monolithic; instead, the developmental process was posited to be the result of "properly organized learning" (Vygotsky 1978:90). The Vygotskyan framework proposes an inextricable link between thinking and speaking and includes three basic concepts: 1) higher mental functions, 2) cultural development and 3) mastering one's own behavioral processes. Although his theory incorporates all higher mental functions, Vygotsky was primarily interested in the relationship between language and thought, and he proposed that "thought is not embodied in the word, but is *completed* in the word" (Luria 1981:153). Use of the term 'word' in this sense is not merely linguistic or psychological, but social, as is the nature of discourse as exchanged between interlocutors. Vygotsky's approach shifted the focus from language as a product to language as a process, one that necessarily involved other human beings. This dialogical view of learning helped to dispel the prior notion that L2 interaction is merely a encoding/decoding event.

The notion of activity is central to the understanding of the Vygotskyan school's social approach to development, where individuals are "active subjects whose knowledge of pre-existing material reality is founded on their interaction with it" (Wertsch 1981:10). In other words, acquisition of knowledge of reality (including language) comes from interactions with their surrounding environment and others in it, all within the sociocultural norms of a particular society. In order to learn, an individual must have interacted with other more capable individuals. By doing so and receiving pertinent instruction, individuals enable themselves to perform alone or with minimal assistance from others. These ideas are entirely compatible with the notion of interactional grammar discussed in Sec. 1.4. Also, they represent an application of Bakhtinian (1986; cf. Schulz 1990; Todorov 1984) theory of the social use of langauge to language learning (Vološinov 1926, 1973).

Speech comprehension and production are both complex cognitive and social processes that proceed in parallel with learning in general as well as with social development. From the Vygotskyan perspective, comprehension, which transcends semantics and syntax, "begins with external speech, moves to an understanding of the meaning of the utterance, and then moves to the subtext or sense" (ibid., 160). Speech production "begins with

thought, proceeds through the inner scheme of the utterance and inner speech, and culminates in expanded external speech" (ibid., 147). In the Vygotskyan view, expanded speech utterances are the result of an ongoing social interaction between speakers whose utterances comprise a web of mutually connected sentences that form a coherent text. Because their utterances are produced in a particular context of activity, they must be analyzed within that context in order to preserve referential and contextual meaning. A broader analysis would include speaker intentions, listener attitudes, the context of the communicative situation and the nature of the information being conveyed, ideas which are not only subsumed under the field of pragmatics, but are also central to my analysis in later chapters.

Speaking, which was considered to be first monologic and subsequently dialogic (Piaget 1929), came to be understood in Vygotskyan terms to develop in just the reverse fashion. Dialogic speech can assume two forms. On the most elementary level, an interlocutor responds to questions posed by the other -- the speaker "simply repeats or reproduces a part of the question and no special, new creative activity is required" (Luria 1981:149) (see further discussion of repetition and scaffolding later in this section and also in Chapter 3); in a more advanced stage, an interlocutor must respond to specific questions

and must actively search for the answer from a variety of alternatives. Monologic speech, an even more complex activity, is "the realization of the speaker's own thought" (ibid., 149). For Vygotsky, this action involves much more than just talking to oneself. In fact, monologic speech allows the speaker to identify problems and formulate possible solutions (Vygotsky 1986).

Vygotsky's social-psychological conceptualization of language (in line with aspects of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis and Bakhtinian language philosophy[11]) frames speech not only as an instrument of cognition but also as a regulator of the flow of mental processes, suggesting that language influences thought. Furthermore, "any higher mental function necessarily goes through an external stage in its development because it is a social function" (Vygotsky 1981:162 cited in Wertsch 1985:62). This proposed sequence highlights what Vygotsky called the "Zone of Proximal Development" (ZPD) -- the place where the logic of adult reasoning can help a child grasp concepts that were, up to that point, inaccessible to the child. The ZPD, which was initially used to describe how L1 learning in children could be facilitated by collaboration with adults or experts, is "the distance between a child's actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the higher level of potential development as determined through problem solving under

adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky 1978:86). In terms of CLEs, the more capable peers would first be other learners, then NSs. Vygotskyan theory also introduced the notion of regulation (see Chapter 4 for examples highlighting this concept), proposing that a speaker's state of regulation can fluctuate depending upon the difficulty of the task being performed. Regulation involves movement through three phases: object-, other- and self-, the optimum state being that of self-regulation. Speakers who attain self-regulated status can conduct themselves more or less on their own, needing only minimal outside assistance to complete the task in which they are engaged. Initially, individuals are object-regulated, controlled by objects in their immediate environment.

The ZPD is the key to other-regulation. According to Vygotsky, all instruction in the learner's ZPD sets in motion a whole series of internal developmental processes. To be most effective, though, instruction must precede development. Other-regulation can involve both repetition and scaffolding. Scaffolding is a key process in the ZPD whereby speakers build their utterances based on those of their interlocutor (for L1, see Slobin 1982; for L2, see Donato 1994, Stewart 1997b; Takahashi 1998). Donato (1994) challenged the widely-held assumption that scaffolding occurs in the presence of an expert participant whose help

is unidirectional. Instead, he adopted a Vygotskyan posture on the notion of scaffolding and attempted to show how L2 learners "mutually construct a scaffold out of the discursive process of negotiating shared contexts of shared understanding" (p. 41). His data revealed learners who were both object- and self-regulated within the same task, results which are corroborated in my findings (see Ch. 4).

Once attaining other-regulated status, learners can then begin the journey towards self-regulation, which allows them to become more independent interlocutors. When faced with communicative obstacles, learners can rely on the 'Principle of Continuous Access' (PCA), which operates across the entire ZPD and provides them with a sort of safety net, as it allows a speaker to revert to other- or object-regulation when faced with difficult tasks. To anticipate how the Vygotskyan approach is used in my analysis, the tactic of utilizing the PCA is particularly useful for speakers who are engaged in the inherently difficult task of L2 communication, because it provides them a means of to regain control and proceed with the interaction.

Initially, learners are object-regulated, the regulating forms being objects in their immediate environment along with forms and structures of the L2. This is particularly true in a classroom setting, where students are just beginning their study of the TL. When

they have learned enough to begin to actually speak and be understood, those speakers who engage in actual problem-solving tasks or other speaking activities which require negotiation of outcome, are well-positioned to make the shift from a state of object-regulation into a state of other-regulation, that is regulation by teachers and other TL speakers. In a truly communicative classroom setting, the shift to other-regulation would transpire rapidly, since learners tend to engage in dialogue with other learners almost immediately. As learners become more competent users of the L2, they can move towards that coveted state of self-regulation, with the PCA available to them at all times. It is undoubtedly the Vygotskyan self-regulated state that students who devote so much time to the study of another language would like to achieve; certainly, their teachers would also share this goal with them. Sadly, "most [language teaching] methodologies... never really allow learners to become self-regulated in the target language" (Lantolf and Frawley 1983:437) due to learners' lack of interactional involvement. In addition, "the very fact that teachers often focus on learner errors while they [learners] are trying to speak or write sends the implicit message that self-regulation is not permitted when using the TL" (Foley 1991:68). This is an unfortunate situation indeed, in a discipline that often

addresses the notion of communicative competence, yet sees such a low percentage of its students ever reaching much beyond the intermediate level.

2.5 The Struggle for Communicative Competence

2.5.1 Beyond Grammatical Competence

Hymes (1972) originally coined the term 'communicative competence' in an attempt to broaden Chomsky's (1965) narrow definition of linguistic competence, which was context-free grammatical knowledge that exists within the purely conceptual 'ideal speaker-hearer.' By bringing a purely conceptual competence into the richly interactive social world, Hymes capitalized on the distinction between competence [unconscious knowledge of language structure that comprises what the (ideal) speaker-listener can say] and performance, actual language use, to highlight the fact that language use in fact "involves concrete persons, situations and actions" (Hymes 1972:273), because language "neither exists in a vacuum nor emerges from a vacuum" (Chastain 1987:161).

Like Vygotsky, Hymes saw language as a process that necessarily involves speakers and hearers, thus recognizing the need to extend the notion of competence to include human beings who interact on social and cultural levels. He spoke of "the continuing socialization and change of competency through life" (ibid., 287) and invoked the term 'differential competence' to refer to the various speakers

within a speech community who have been affected by their social life not only in their outward performance but also in their inner competence. Although Hymes was specifically referring to those persons who were semilingual in two languages of a speech community, I believe the idea is pertinent to this discussion, because his ideas can be extrapolated to L2 learners whose developing interlanguage is affected by social factors both inside and outside the classroom. To use Hymes' distinction, L2 grammatical knowledge would be the competence and L2 use the performance. Thus, Hymes made his case for a cultural component of language, resulting in the division between grammatical competence and sociolinguistic competence, broadening the notion of communicative competence to include "cultural knowledge that includes social and psychological principles governing the use of language, as well as abstract grammatical rules" (Schiffrin 1994:408).

Taylor (1988) criticizes Hymes for using the term 'competence' on the grounds that it introduces "a comparative and relative dimension, thus losing sight of the fact that for Chomsky, competence is an *absolute* dimension" (p. 155). He suggests as an alternative 'communicative proficiency,' which would have components of 'grammatical competence' + 'grammatical proficiency' and 'pragmatic competence' + 'pragmatic proficiency' and 'strategic competence' + 'strategic proficiency.' Richards

et al. define proficiency as "degree of skill with which a person can use a language" (1985:204). I agree with Taylor that proficiency is a more appropriate designation, especially as applied to one's L2.[12]

Canale and Swain's (1980) model of communicative competence expanded on Hymes' proposed two-way division to include an added dimension, that of strategic competence, which they described as knowledge of "verbal and nonverbal communication strategies which may be called into action to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence" (1980:30) and may "enhance the effectiveness of communication" (Swain 1984:189). The communicative competence framework was subsequently extended by Canale (1983) to include discourse competence - the ability to combine form and meaning to produce [and understand] a cohesive, coherent spoken (or written) text. Since then, a multitude of other researchers from several different fields, including anthropology, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, second language acquisition, language pedagogy, language testing and assessment, and discourse analysis have addressed the notion of communicative competence, recognizing the complexity of the phenomenon in that it is comprised of a variety of tactics and strategies, each of which plays a role in the development of strategic competence, which may also be relative

(Bachman 1990; Bialystok 1982; Celce-Murcia with Dörnyei and Thurrell 1994; Dörnyei 1995; Dörnyei and Thurrell 1991; Faerch and Kasper 1983a, 1984a; Gumperz 1981 1984a; Paribakht 1985; Richards and Sukwiwat 1983; Rost and Ross 1991; Savignon 1997; Schachter 1990; Tarone 1980, 1981, 1984).

Gumperz's (1981:325) definition of communicative competence, "the knowledge of linguistic and related communicative conventions that speakers must have to *initiate* and *sustain* conversational involvement," is particularly appealing. 'Sustain' appears to be the operative word for Gumperz' perspective, since keeping the talk flowing is a highly desirable characteristic of any spoken interaction. Gumperz argued that studies of communicative competence must transcend the boundaries of traditional grammatical systems to include not only sentential meaning but contextualization cues as well:

> To create and sustain conversational involvement, we require knowledge and abilities which go considerably beyond the grammatical competence we need to decode short isolated messages...Once involved in a conversation, both speaker and hearer must actively respond to what transpires by signalling involvement, either directly through words or indirectly through the use of gestures or similar non-verbal symbols. (Gumperz 1982:1).

Contextualization cues (Gumperz 1982, 1984b; 1992) encompass the means by which speakers and hearers communicate the nature of the exchange, how the semantic

content is to be understood, and how current utterances relate to prior ones. Contextualization cues include, but are not be limited to, formulaic expressions, openings and closings, choice of lexical items or syntactic patterns, choice of dialect, style-switching strategies, turn-taking conventions and prosodic information. It is not difficult to see that there are a large number of factors influencing any given interaction, many of which cannot possibly be learned from classroom instruction but must be mastered through use, especially since these phenomena are "rarely consciously noted and almost never talked about directly" (Gumperz 1982:131). They are, however, an integral part of the repertoire of all NSs that provide the mechanisms for interlocutors to function as effective conversational partners. Because the use of contextualization cues carries extra-linguistic knowledge that may differ between languages, they can cause unique problems for NNSs.

The turn-taking procedure in English conversation is that *usually* only one person talks at a time (Sacks et al. 1974). When overlaps do occur, they tend to be brief. However, turn-taking does vary with dialect (see Klee 1998 and Tannen 1984 for different views). In CLEs, then, these overlaps could be considered as invasive by NNSs who are unaccustomed to interacting with NSs of Spanish. Gumperz's work in this area has important implications for SLA. Because they are context-bound, contextualization cues do

not readily lend themselves to teaching but are "best learned through practice in actual interaction where errors can be good-naturedly corrected" (1990:237). Thus, the ensuing section will explore the notion of strategic competence and how the implementation of particular tactics and strategies can affect the outcome of a given communicative situation.

2.5.2 Developing Strategic Competence

Strategic competence involves the use of communication strategies (CSs), a term first introduced by Váradi (1973), when he referred to learners' conscious attempts to communicate when their interlanguage structures are insufficient to convey their intended thoughts (cf. Bialystok 1983, 1990; Faerch and Kasper 1983b; Kellerman 1991). Ellis (1992) declares that CSs are "problem-oriented...employed by the learner because he lacks or cannot gain access to the linguistic resources required to express an intended meaning...or [has] insufficient means to implement the production plan" (p. 181). In a later work, he writes that "all strategies can be used to expand resources" and that "the main contribution of CSs is to keep the channel open," which seems to contradict his prior statement and indicates that CSs can also be success-oriented. In addition, CSs are not confined to NNSs; they are used by NSs as well. Strategies then, allow speakers to communicate within restrictions (their own or their

interlocutor's) and adapt to "a variety of changing and often unexpected interpersonal conditions" (Savignon 1997:47). The literature on CSs refers to all of the behavior that de Certeau (1984) separates into the two categories of tactic and strategy. Generally we would see NNSs employing tactics, while NSs would use strategies.

The term CSs was adopted by Tarone (1978) as she introduced her typology for their classification. Subsequent work (Tarone 1980) expanded on this line of thought by locating CSs within the performance domain and relating them to communicative competence using Canale and Swain's (1980) framework and dividing them into strategies for learning and strategies for use. (For further discussion of learning strategies, see Rubin and Thompson (1982) and O'Malley and Chamot (1990), as well as my proposed model of interactional proficiency in Chapter 6). Tarone's definition of CS as "a mutual attempt of interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared" (ibid., 420) helped her to formulate her interactional perspective on CSs, which takes the negotiation of meaning of meaning as its central tenet. In de Certeau's (1984) terms then, the task for L2 learners is to turn tactics into strategies in order to function as effective conversational partners.

Faerch and Kasper investigated the psycholinguistic aspects of language learning and offered a revision of Tarone's typology suggesting instead that CSs were part of a learner's underlying cognitive structures. Their psycholinguistic definition of CSs as "potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal" (Faerch and Kasper 1980:81) identified two types of strategies -- those used for solving problems in production and those used when encountering receptive problems. According to Faerch and Kasper, speakers adopt a posture of either avoidance (reduction) or achievement (expansion) in attaining their communicative goals.

Reduction strategies can be formal or functional. Formal reduction strategies involve the use of readily available items and abilities and are likely motivated by a speaker's desire for correctness and/or fluency, while functional reduction strategies surface during the planning stage when speakers realize themselves to be linguistically deficient and opt to reduce their communicative goal to avoid the problem (Faerch and Kasper 1983). These reduction strategies may be a type of de Certeau's (1984) tactic. Learners who attempt to *expand* their communicative resources instead of diminishing their communicative goal use achievement strategies, which are either compensatory (code-switching, inter- and intralingual transfer,

paraphrase, word coinage, restructuring, cooperative and non-linguistic strategies) or retrieval (waiting, using formally similar item, using a semantically similar item, searching via other languages, retrieval from learning situations, and sensory procedures) in nature (ibid). So, expansive strategies move more towards what de Certeau (1984) would recognize as a strategy.

A similar view of strategic competence is advocated in the notion of 'communicative language ability' (Bachman 1990), a perspective which also draws on Faerch and Kasper's model and embraces the processes of assessment, planning and implementation in order to achieve a communicative goal. This model also encompasses the interactional domain when it "recognizes that the communicative ability involves both competence and the capacity for implementing said competence.

Frawley and Lantolf (1985) revised a portion of Faerch & Kasper's typology of CSs and applied the Vygotskyan notion of regulation (object-, other- and self-) to their category of formal reduction strategies. They posited the object-regulation (refer to Section 2.4 for discussion of this Vygotskyan term) function as the fact that learners are regulated by their interlanguage. They rejected the idea that speakers produce reduced, or incorrect, forms, claiming instead that these are forms appropriate to their interlanguage. Forms are not reduced, they are not yet

acquired (cf. Khanji 1996, Abdesslem 1994). Other-regulation comes from one's interlocutor in the particular speech event, and L2 speakers make a choice of a particular form or lexical item because the presence of others forces them to do so. So, the choice is within the speaker, not within their linguistic system. Formal reduction strategies that are self-regulated are conscious choices made by speakers that allow them to maintain their learner status "in order to reap the communicative benefit of being viewed as non-native" (Frawley and Lantolf 1985:152; cf. Kramsch 1997),[13] one of which is the power of the weak (de Certeau 1984).

Tarone's (1978, 1980) classification of CSs outlined a variety of paraphrasing tactics including approximation, word coinage and circumlocution, as well as borrowing moves such as language switch and literal translation, all of which focus on the inadequate nature of the learner's linguistic system. In Vygotskyan terms, any missing or reduced forms are unacquired and are germane to a learner's interlanguage (Frawley and Lantolf 1985). Thus, perceived inadequacies are not deficiencies that must be overcome, but rather are facilitative moves which allow the interaction to continue. Tarone's notion of appeal for assistance, which will be discussed in this particular investigation as other-regulation (Vygotsky 1986). Tarone's subsequent differentiation between CSs and production

strategies (PSs), which she defined as "attempts to use one's linguistic system...that lack the interactional focus on the negotiation of meaning" (Tarone 1981:289) included tactics such as the incorporation of prefabricated routines, discourse planning, and rehearsal, all of which "simplify the task of speaking in a given situation" (ibid.) and contribute to one's ability to engage in effective L2 communication, reflect a somewhat more process-oriented viewpoint.

Lantolf and Frawley's (1985) study offered a functional perspective on communicative competence by re-defining the concepts of 'communication' and 'strategy' in light of Vygotskyan theory. These authors rejected the 'container and conduit metaphors' (cf. Lakoff and Johnson 1980) typically applied to language, proposing instead that communication is "a symbiosis of isolated individuals who interact in a communicative situation by virtue of their beliefs about, not knowledge of, the interlocutor" (Lantolf and Frawley 1985:144). Using the Soviet framework, they argued that communication is about individuals who maintain their individuality, or state of self-regulation, in the presence of others.

The commonalities of the various approaches to CSs is that, although some focus more on interaction while others may be more process-oriented, all appear to highlight the interlocutor as opposed to the message, viewing tactical

and strategic ability as an additional layer of knowledge within and between speakers. In the final analysis, such ability is critical in that it can not only act as a substitute for limited grammatical ability (Loschky and Bley-Vroman 1990; McIntyre et al. 1998) but also largely determines fluency and conversational ability (Dörnyei and Thurrell 1991).

2.5.3 Toward Communicative Proficiency

Participation in spoken interactions involves much more than just knowledge of grammar. Also involved are: controlling rules for turn-taking and adjacency pairings; offering intelligent comments and responding appropriately to comments made by others; protecting one's own face and that of other participants. et cetera. In order to achieve communicative proficiency, speakers must not only develop the ability to construct utterances but must also be able to consider the other's perspective, assess the situational requirements, and become familiar with cultural norms (Horowitz 1987).[14] Thus, it is imperative that L2 learners be afforded ample opportunities to speak the TL, preferably with NSs if they are to learn how to speak in an appropriate and effective manner. Communicative competence, or proficiency, then, can be seen as "a social production, an interactional achievement...that develops through communication across conversational time" (Meyer 1990:209), and a learner's interlanguage can be seen as an

'approximative' (Abdesslem 1996) or 'transitional competence' (Corder 1967), or proficiency, that develops with L2 use.[15]

Unquestionably, a certain amount of grammatical knowledge is required for effective conversational participation, but until a learner's interlanguage has developed sufficiently, tactics provide a means to compensate for limited linguistic ability. However, in order to achieve some semblance of communicative proficiency, students "need to learn some social conditions for the new language and to solve some mapping problems between forms and social conditions" (Bialystok 1993:54). In addition, in order to sustain interactional involvement in CLES, however, speakers need to be aware of the power structure that exists and be able to access the tactics/strategies that will allow them to counteract (to the greatest extent possible) whatever imbalance that exists between them and their interlocutor.

2.6 Power and Face in Spoken Interactions

2.6.1 The Question of Power

The dominant role is clearly preferred over the submissive one in almost all arenas, and much time and energy have been dedicated to the quest for power (Ng and Bradac 1993; Pan 1995; Thimm et al. 1995). Discourse is no exception. Communication skills provide much protection against the verbal onslaught of another (Odell 1987). As

Lakoff (1990) notes, "wherever there is a power imbalance, the potential for abuse exists."

Of course, not all interactions require an elaborate defense; yet the fact remains that, in CLEs, there is usually an unbalanced power relationship between interlocutors. Shuy's (1987) notion of 'unequal balance' sees the powerful as being members of a highly valued group who are strong, active and competent and those with less power belonging to a devalued group and seen as weak, passive and incompetent (Ryan and Giles 1982; cf. de Certeau 1984; Erickson 1976, Fairclough 1989). Beebe and Giles (1984:22) claim that CLEs have a "built-in status differential... which gives an automatic edge of control to the native speaker."

In a similar vein, Fairclough (1989) identifies four constraints that more powerful participants may place on less powerful ones. These restrictions not only entail the use of certain linguistic forms but may also dictate choice of discourse type within which the interlocutors must operate. Such constraints impose limits 1) on content - what is said or done; 2) on relations - concerning the social interactions that people enter into in discourse; 3) on subjects - the status differences between interlocutors; and 4) on form - a constraint which has special implications for NNSs. NNSs who cannot easily manipulate certain forms may be considered to be

functioning at a deficit, feeling daunted, frightened or ridiculous, and they may find themselves in a situation that "both restricts access and generates awe" (Fairclough 1989:68).[16]

However, an 'all or nothing' dichotomy fails to account for the communicative effects in the situation (Thimm et al. 1995; Treichler, Frankel, Dramarae, Zoppi and Beckman 1984). There are a number of factors to be considered in any comprehensive analysis of power: 1) the interactive behavior of each participant, 2) the details of the interaction, and 3) the participants' willingness and ability to negotiate to an acceptable solution (Treichler et al. 1984), because communicative ability varies by interlocutor and by interaction. The power/status relationship between interlocutors has been shown to influence the outcome of a given interaction (Ainsworth-Vaughn 1998; Bremer and Simonot 1996; Carrier 1999; de Certeau 1984; Davis 1988; Gass and Varonis 1985; Lakoff 1990; Thimm *et al.* 1995; Treichler *et al.* 1984; Vasseur *et al.* 1996; Zuengler 1991), and familiarity of topic is crucial in that it "situates the speaker within the interaction [and] it can shape one's conversational role" (Zuengler 1993:184).

Better stated, power (or status) is relative to the social and cultural backgrounds of a speaker and is susceptible to change caused by particular situations

and/or audiences (Carrier 1999). In CLEs, interlocutors inevitably encounter interactional difficulties, but these do not have to be overwhelming. Negotiation can resolve many such problems, yet it remains questionable just how much NNSs can engage in negotiation due to linguistic shortcomings in the TL, inequality of status and perceived social distance.[17] However, even though one unit of any relationship is at times stronger than another, "seldom is one so strong that the other has no bargaining ability whatsoever" (Kramarae, Schulz and O'Barr 1984a:11). Power can shift during the course of the interaction, so the dynamic nature of power cannot be overlooked:

> Power flows among and between those who have chosen to speak and listen to each other - not merely from top to bottom from those who have more...to those who have less (Nichols 1984:42).

2.6.1.1 Types of Power

A person may be said to exercise power over another to the extent that she/he is "able to control the behavior of another" (Brown and Gilman 1960:255). Ng and Bradac (1993) identify positive and negative types of power 'to' and power 'over,' the former as behavior that realizes interactional goals, the latter as actions that hinders the achievement of any such goals.

de Certeau's (1984) distinction between tactic (used by the less powerful) and strategy (accessible to the more powerful) is practical in its application to the analysis

of CLEs. In making such a distinction, de Certeau delineates operational characteristics common to each type of participant (1984:36ff). The strategic individual exhibits 1) dominion of place over time, i.e. the ability to maintain independence, regardless of [communicative] circumstances [or interlocutor]; 2) mastery of place through sight due to the ability to predict, or anticipate (refer to Section 1.1);[18] and 3) autonomy of place derived from the ability to establish one's own location, or in this case, linguistic space. These are all generally characteristics of NSs.

The role of the tactical interlocutor would, on the other hand, be associated with the NNS, who would find her/himself in a vastly different base: 1) lack of a personal space, i.e. operating in foreign [linguisitc] territory that is imposed on her/him and organized by a foreign power, e.g. a NS; 2) diminished [linguistic] foresight, which can result not only in an a) inability to distance oneself from one's opponent [interlocutor] but also in b) reactionary behavior based on the demands of the particular [communicative] interaction, which can obstruct and/or delay the acquisition process; and 3) lack of autonomy, especially in the initial phases of [interlanguage] development. Yet, although NNSs appear to be in a "one-down" position in CLEs, the implementation of certain tactics can provide a mechanism for navigating

interactional difficulties. Additionally, as NNS interlocutors become more proficient and more comfortable functioning in CLEs, they can begin to learn tactics, then strategies, just like their NS counterparts. Armed with such, they can learn to maneuver in the L2 and become effective conversational partners.

2.6.1.1.1 Power 'to'

In certain situations, NNSs in conversation with cooperative NSs have a kind of power at their disposal. The use of tactics (de Certeau 1984) can empower NNS by allowing them to exercise some measure of control over their interlocutor(s) by persuading their conversational partner(s) to: 1) carry the load of the conversation, 2) work extra hard to interpret their often ineffective attempts at L2 communication, 3) simplify their own utterances, 4) listen more intently, 5) articulate more clearly than usual or 5) supply missing words or phrases. Accommodating NSs who are accustomed to conversing with NNSs of lower proficiency levels are often willing to expend much effort to ensure the success of the conversation.

2.6.1.1.2 Power 'over'

'Power over' involves dominance and submission and is closely linked with Fairclough's (1989) constraints imposed on the less powerful and with Erickson's (1976) notion of 'gatekeeping.' The constraints earmarked by Fairclough,

which not only involve the use of particular linguistic forms, but also dictate the discourse type within which the interlocutors must operate, locate power with the more capable interlocutor. In the case of CLEs, NSs clearly wield this type of power (cf. Zuengler 1991), although certainly not all choose to use it in a negative manner. Gatekeeping as defined by Erickson situates power with the gatekeeper, the more powerful participant who controls access to understanding and determines the overall success of an interaction. Again, in CLEs, it is the NSs who generally occupy this role. In interactions involving an uncooperative NS, a NNS may find him/herself on the short end of an unequal encounter in which an overbearing, power-wielding NS attempts to control the direction of the conversation, and refuses to reformulate utterances in a manner more comprehensible to the NNS. Non-accommodating NSs can sometimes even put words in a NNS's mouth. In some instances, it may only appear that the NS is making helpful adjustments when in actuality the rephrasals are becoming more and more complex. Complicating the picture even further is the notion of face, which is treated in the next section.

2.6.2 The Notion of Face

Closely related to power is the notion of face (Goffman 1967; Brown & Levinson 1987), an important social factor to be considered in the analysis of conversation,

and one that is particularly relevant to the analysis of CLEs. As mentioned previously, face has two sides -- negative and positive. Negative face is the desire to be unimpeded in one's actions, while positive face is the desire for approval. Face is manifested in conversation through face-threatening actions (FTAs) and face-saving actions (FSAs). FTAs are those which are potentially harmful to either the negative or positive face of the speaker or hearer. Acts which might threaten the negative face of the *hearer* are orders and requests, suggestions and advice, reminders, warnings and threats, offers, promises, compliments and expressions of strong (negative) emotions. Those which might threaten the *speaker's* negative face include thanking, making excuses, accepting offers, responding to *faux pas*, and mitigating. Acts which can threaten the positive face of the *hearer* are disapproval, criticism or ridicule, contradictions or disagreement, challenges, expressions of violent emotions, mention of taboo topics and blatant non-cooperation. Potentially threatening to the *speaker's* positive face are apologizing, accepting compliments, confessing and losing emotional or physical control and humiliating oneself.

Craig et al. (1986:462ff) seek to "extend and correct" the Brown and Levinson framework. In so doing, they offer several tenets as a springboard for further theoretical development: 1) distinguish between strategies that

counteract threats to speaker face and hearer face; 2) separate strategies as to type of face threatened; 3) don't assume that all social situations are cooperative (cf. Penman 1987, 1990); 4) take context into account when assessing face (cf. Stewart 1996b) and 5) separate the constructs of social judgments and facework strategies with regards to politeness (cf. Fraser 1990; Mao 1994). A further refinement of these tenets would be to distinguish strategies from tactics.

The ability to maintain face in interaction is an aspect of communicative competence that is necessarily complicated in CLEs. What seems fairly routine in L1 interactions often becomes quite complex for NNSs who are struggling just to articulate their thoughts. FSAs are part of L1 linguistic competence. In order to successfully employ FSAs, speakers must be perceptive -- aware of how their utterances have been interpreted and how they should interpret the utterances of others. But since FSAs are language- and culture-specific, face maintenance becomes much more challenging in CLEs. Such strategies in the L2 must be learned and practiced again and again by NNSs who often to have reduced opportunities for interacting in the L2, especially in a FL setting. Moreover, the process can be further complicated due to differences in the quality of face in a cross-cultural situation.

In their work on face in interethnic communication, Scollon and Scollon (1983) discuss the notion of 'metamessage' - a second message that gives information about the primary message, about why someone is speaking and how what they are saying is to be interpreted. Both NSs and NNSs can be tranmitting a metamessage, and neither may be one the one they intend. Incomplete grammatical competence can be inherently face-threatening to NNSs as it often causes misunderstanding and/or can render speakers incapable of saying exactly what they mean. This grammatical deficiency may cause NNSs to project an incorrect image of themselves as incompetent interlocutors. Moreover, NNSs who lack conversational experience with NSs may not yet have a highly developed sense of tactical ability, so it can be difficult for them to extricate themselves from interactional troubles when they occur.

Thus, CLEs are prime locations for the development of face-threatening situations. NNSs are often limited to whatever their L2 vocabulary permits, and few (other than those highly proficient speakers) find themselves in a position to worry about how it comes across. NSs, depending on prior experiences with NNSs and/or their level of accommodation, may or may not pay special attention to the content of their utterances. Fortunately, the maintenance of face is usually "a condition of an interaction, not its objective" (Goffman 1967:12).

Goffman (1967) discusses two kinds of FSAs that are available to speakers in any interaction: the avoidance process and the corrective process. The avoidance process includes the following behaviors: 1) avoid topics that might elicit FTAs, 2) change the topic, 3) phrase replies with ambiguity to preserve the others' face, 4) make a joke, 5) offer an explanation, 6) stay out of situations where FTAs might occur (which accounts for many L2 students' difficulties -- they don't want to venture into such face-threatening arenas, so they opt for silence or minimal speech), 7) terminate the interaction, 8) ignore the FTA, or 9) openly acknowledge the event while denying the FTA. The corrective process acknowledges FTAs while trying to correct them via challenge, offer, acceptance or thanks, all of which are themselves FTAs.[19] I identify many of these in my analysis in Chapter 4.

2.7 Manifestation of (Non)accommodation in CLEs

As noted in Chapter 1, there are a variety of interactional maneuvers that interlocutors can access during the course of a spoken interaction. These tactics and strategies, which can be used to adjust whatever power imbalance exists in CLEs, to save face and to compensate for linguistic deficiency, include repetition, regulation, laughter, and others. The willingness and ability to employ such tactics and strategies in actual discourse situations is what characterizes an interlocutor's choice

to accommodate (or not). Thus, accommodation can be seen as both a state of being as well as a tactic or strategy used by NNSs or NSs for navigating communicative obstacles. Accommodation involves either adaptation to each other's communicative behaviors or accentuation of their differences. In conversation, speakers can assume one of three positions: 1) show solidarity (converge), 2) create distance (diverge) or 3) maintain their position (a more subtle form of divergence). Convergence may involve identification with the communicative patterns of an individual internal to the interaction, while divergence may identify with linguistic norms external to the situation.

In the case of CLEs, convergence could bring the conversation onto more equal footing. As noted in the previous discussion of power, NNSs may be capable of exerting some measure of control over their interlocutor by convincing her/him to carry the load of the conversation or to engage in one or more communicative behaviors that will facilitate the interaction. Additionally, NSs with an accommodating spirit are often willing to go to great lengths to achieve interactional success. Modifications in speech rate, pronunciation rate, vocabulary, speech style, etc. can make NSs' utterances much more intelligible. NSs who are willing to adopt more effective discourse management strategies and attune themselves to their

interlocutor's perceived level of communicative competence can have a very positive effect on the interaction.[20] NSs who can focus more of their energy towards interpreting NNS speech or can engage in the co-construction of utterances (Ferrara 1992; Goodwin 1979) can facilitate the interactional process and allow the talk to continue to flow. The power imbalance can also be levelled by NSs who make a conscious attempt to downplay their dominant role and encourage active participation by NNSs (Bremer and Simonot 1996).

While some NSs display an extremely cooperative spirit and go well beyond the call of duty to accommodate to their interlocutors, others only seem to do so. Their attempts to reconstruct utterances, which at first glance might appear genuine, may later be discovered to have done little to foster comprehension. Some of their reformulated turns either remain opaque or become more complex due to exact repetition and/or poor lexical choices. All of this can be construed as a sort of power play by NSs, be it conscious or not. Thus, divergence is alive and well in many CLEs, some of which border on being competitive, even challenging (Ainsworth-Vaughn 1998). .

2.7.1 Repetition

Repetition in discourse has been studied extensively (Bublitz 1988; Gumperz 1982; Johnstone 1987, 1994a, 1994b; Merritt 1994; Norrick 1994; Tannen 1987b, 1989) and has

been widely mentioned in the SLA literature as well (Gass and Madden 1985; Day et al. 1984; Hatch 1978; Knox 1994; Long 1983; Sato 1986; Tomlin 1994; Varonis and Gass 1983, 1985). Repetition as a strategy is prominent characteristic in L1 development (cf. Bennett-Kastor 1994), so it is only natural that it would be an integral part of SLA as well.

Tannen (1989:48ff) identifies specific areas of talk that benefit from repetition which should be particularly appealing to CLE interlocutors: 1) production: repetition allows a speaker to produce fluent speech while formulating upcoming remarks; 2) comprehension: repetition fosters understanding with the recycling of information as opposed to presenting all new material; 3) discourse: repetition serves as a cohesive device that links utterances and shows their relationship to prior discourse; 4) interactional: the use of repetition helps accomplish social goals and manage conversation; 5) interpersonal: repetition displays "involvement" (Tannen 1989) by providing a response to another's utterance and giving evidence of one's own participation. Moving beyond repetition is the notion of repair.

2.7.2 Repair

Repair in conversation occurs in an organized fashion and may be used to counteract a variety of difficulties in discourse (Schegloff, Sacks and Jefferson 1977). In CLEs,

repairs may be made by NSs or NNSs and may be initiated by either party. Corrective repair behaviors fall under the category of side sequence (Jefferson 1972 for L1; cf. Varonis and Gass 1983 for L2). In CLEs particularly, such moves are sustainers of conversation rather than interrupters.[21] Day et al. (1984) identify two types of corrective feedback -- on-record and off-record. An on-record correction has only one interpretation, is supplied with declaratory intonation and is the main thrust of the turn, while an off-record adjustment is subject to multiple interpretations, is ambiguous and is not the main thrust of the turn. They argue that the use of a mixture of the two in a non-threatening manner by NSs can apprise learners that changes are needed in their utterances while encouraging their efforts at communication and allowing the conversation to continue.

Yet repair is certainly not limited to error correction. Pragmatically, repair may be used strategically by NSs who anticipate interactional difficulty on the part of a hearer, a fairly common occurrence in CLEs. In such instances, repair may result in the complete re-formulation of a speaker's utterance. From a Vygotskyan standpoint, repair is aligned with other- and self-regulation. A NNS's ability to employ tactics and engage the help of an accommodating, strategic interlocutor, provides the mechanism with which learners

can regain control of the situation and continue without completely disrupting the interaction.

Joint productions (Brenneis 1986; Duranti 1986; Ferrara 1992; Goodwin 1979; Schegloff 1982), or collaborative completions (Lerner 1987, 1991; Nofsinger 1991) are yet another interactional manifestation of the Vygotskyan notion of regulation in CLEs. While these joint efforts in CLEs sometimes stem from a learner's inability to express her/himself appropriately in the L2, at other times they emerge naturally as speakers are involved in the co-construction of talk. Thus, the joint realizations may take the form of extensions, predictable completions, helpful completions or invited completions Ferrara 1992), some of which appear in my data and will be discussed in detail in Chapter 4.

Another possible occurrence in the process of repair is laughter, which is treated in the upcoming section.

2.7.3 Laughter

Laughter can enter a conversation in a variety of ways. Speaker laughter, 'the occasional brief laughs speakers intermingle with their utterances' (Cox 1982:3), has a variety of uses in conversation. Speaker laughter tells the hearer how the speaker sees a particular utterance (whether ironically, sarcastically, facetiously, disdainfully or with amusement). In addition, laughter may be included to indicate that something funny is coming up

in the conversation or to initiate shared laughter. Cox (1982) identifies four functions of speaker laughter, three of which 'appear to violate or push against conversational norms,' and would hence be potential FTAs: 1) boasting, 2) challenging, 3) making emotionally-laden statements and 4) expressing humor. Boasts allow for bragging about one's own abilities[22]; challenges are somewhat less likely to occur in cohesive groups; and emotionally-laden comments are often perceived as face-threatening. Although the expression of amusement would not normally be perceived as an FTA, in CLEs, it might carry a more negative overtone.

Jefferson (1979) identifies the following responses to speaker laughter: a) recipient laughter - constitutes acceptance of a 'laugh invitation;' b) recipient silence - may indicate misunderstanding of the utterance on the part of the hearer[23] or may generate further pursuit of laughter by the speaker; c) recipient non-laughing speech - declines the speaker's laugh invitation and allows the conversation to continue.[24] Commonly used as a backchannelling device, laughter reinforces or responds to the current speaker, lending support and agreement to what is being said. It can also be used in a joking manner to tease and can display intimacy or frame an interaction as playful (Glenn 1987).

Laughing is one of the few things that people do simultaneously in conversation (cf. Sacks 1992:571, Vol.

II). A 'fundamentally social activity' (Glenn 1989:126), laughter usually occurs in the presence of others and is most enjoyed when others participate. In fact, not only is it acceptable to laugh together, but solo laughter is often suspect (Edmonson 1987).[25] Interactional or shared laughter, 'conversation's greatest device for conviviality and co-alignment' (Moerman 1988:73), can occur even if the current speaker does not participate. In addition to carrying information about the content of the conversation, shared laughter may display the nature of the interpersonal relationships.

People often laugh because others are laughing, or they may laugh to maintain group loyalty or to gain group acceptance (Giles and Oxford 1978:97ff). Laughter can also be used to tease[26], to amuse or to display intimacy (Glenn 1987). Laughter has a dark side that must be considered as well. Not only can it be used to interrupt and reinterpret what has been said (certainly FTAs), but laughter can also be used negatively in the following ways: to ridicule, to turn the tables on, make uneasy, or cause trouble for (Schenkein 1972); to show nervousness or embarrassment; to relieve fear or misery, or to express feelings about the bad fortune of others (Norrick 1993), all of which are FTAs. In this vein, laughter and face are intertwined.

Laughter (as discussed in Chapter 5) is a face-saving device that can be used by NSs and NNSs alike. Unsure of

the structure of their utterances, NNSs can use laughter as an FSA to assume an apologetic stance aimed at disguising ignorance (Giles and Oxford 1978) or 'as a framing device for potentially ambiguous comments' (Sacks unpublished manuscript, cited in Cox 1982:1; cf. Goffman 1974; Tannen 1993 for further discussion of 'framing'). Laughter becomes a buffer, a sort of face-saving mechanism that accompanies a NNS's turn.[27] Thus, laughter can help "extricate them from or remedy interactional difficulties" (Glenn 1991:151) by prolonging the exchange and providing additional time for them to gather their thoughts while simultaneously signalling good will:

> Laughter offers relief, at least for the moment, allowing some breathing space, enabling the laugher to step back, to remove him- or herself temporarily and to comment without uttering a single word (Sanders 1995:15).

In the interim, NNSs may be able to interpret a previously unintelligible utterance, reformulate their own utterance or even elicit assistance from their interlocutor as they recognize their own limitations.

NS laughter can function as both an FSA and an FTA and is an added dimension that NNSs must contend with. L2 speakers, particularly those with limited proficiency, may perceive laughter in a more negative way than might have been intended, especially if their interlocutors are unfamiliar and/or act uncooperatively.[28] However, in more amicable situations, laughter can help to create a non-

threatening conversational atmosphere or to diminish the force of a potential FTA. Moreover, NS laughter can invite NNSs to join in, their resulting shared laughter acknowledging the error and showing "like-minded orientation towards the laughable item" (Glenn 1989:140), thus diminishing the threat of a potential FTA. As a comment on form, laughter can function metalinguistically to allow interlocutors to "point to and agree on what is a funny construction or word choice" (Norrick 1994:17).[29] Thus, laughter has both grammatical and pragmatic functions.

Accommodation, repetition, repair, laughter, face. These are the tactics and strategies of CLEs that will be explored in the upcoming chapters.

2.8 End Notes

1. One popular textbook for Spanish that employs the communicative approach is Dos Mundos (Terrell et al. 1994). Others which are similar include 1) ¡Arriba! (Zayas-Bazán et al. 1997), which is " a complete and versatile Spanish program designed to offer a balanced approach to language and culture" (p. xiv); 2) Destinos (VanPatten, Marks and Teschner 1997), a comprehension-based program for the teaching of Spanish that "allows beginning language learners to hear Spanish and experience cultural diversity while following a compelling story" (p. xv); 3) Mosaicos (Castells et al. 1994), which "seeks to combine the best elements of contemporary approaches to FL instruction" and has as its goal "to develop students' abilities to communicate in both oral and written Spanish" by through the use of "a communicatively oriented sequence of vocabulary and functions, visually structured language contexts and stimulating activities" (p. xvii) and 4) Sabías que? (VanPatten, Lee and Ballman 2000), which uses an information-based task approach, a communicative approach that "weaves together content language learning

and interactive tasks in which information is exchanged," without sacrificing basic grammar (p. xix).

2. See Van Pattten (1998) for an interesting discussion on the various perceptions of the term "communicative."

3. From my experience in teaching Spanish over the last decade, there exists a disparity in FL teaching approaches in the classroom. Having taught Spanish in 3 different undergraduate institutions (serving at both LSU and Pitzer College in supervisory capacities), I have had the opportunity to observe a wide variety of teaching assistants, instructors and professors teaching all levels of introductory classes of Spanish. The challenges of teaching communicatively (e.g. creating a more learner-centered environment, promoting interaction among students and allowing them to 'discover language' through use opposed to imparting knowledge about language) are often not fully met. Many seemed to be holding on to more traditional ideas about language, which were reflected in their methods of language teaching. See Wing (1987) who reports similar findings. This is not intended as a criticism, but rather as an observation.

4. The grammar-translation method is, of course, still alive and well in the teaching of the classics.

5. Although Celce-Murcia's focus was ESL, which is somewhat different from many FL teaching settings, the priniciples remain the same. Just how much students can benefit from rigorous grammar instruction, sometimes to the exclusion of actual communicative practice, when all they want to do is "be able to speak a little of language X" remains unresolved.

6. Bialystok (1978), Rutherford (1987) and Schmidt (1990) see C-R as a process that facilitates language learning.

7. Rutherford and Sharwood-Smith (1985) argue that C-R actually aids the L2 acquisition process, but this has not been substantiated.

8. For examples see Horowitz et al. (1997), which describes a graduate course in FL education at the University of Texas at Austin that was designed to help teachers "foster learner autonomy through student teacher collaboration" (p. 528), and Wilhelm (1997), which delineates a collaborative model in a TESOL teacher training course offered through the Linguistics Department at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

9. Electronic activities may occur inside or outside the classroom. They include tasks such as networking between students at home and abroad interaction between students and teachers, interactive videodisc simulations, and group activities around the computer and computer-assisted monitoring of students' individual learning strategies (Oxford 1997:449).

10. NSs may not be available to serve as partners for learners in all foreign language (FL) classrooms (especially with some of the less commonly taught languages), but with languages like Spanish, they are in ample supply in most places.

11. Interestingly, while Whorf focussed on grammar, Bakhtin's work centered on discourse, which he referred to as "language in its concrete living totality" (1984[1929]: 181 cited in Schultz 1990:21).

12. See Chapter 6 where I suggest a model for interactional proficiency.

13. This is comparable to the "divergence" aspect of accommodation theory (Giles 1973, Giles *et al.* 1987) that has been expanded to include applications for L2 (cf. Beebe and Giles 1984; Beebe and Zuengler 1983). Accommodation theory was mentioned in Sec. 1.6.4, is expanded in Sec. 2.6 and 2.7, and is explored in detail in Chapter 4.

14. Yule and Tarone (1990) concur when they argue that strategically competent speakers must be able to assess the relationship between their own knowledge and that of their interlocutor and then use their linguistic system accordingly.

15. In line with the notion of interlanguage, Horowitz (1986:687) calls the production of non-target forms "a natural part of the language development process."

16. Remember that reduced linguistic competence is inherently face-threatening (see Sec. 1.6.4)

17. It has been suggested that certain interactions discourage negotiation -- it is more likely to occur between status equals or members of a social network whose relationships are closer or more open to redefinition (Wolfson 1986, 1989; Beebe and Cummings 1995 cited in Carrier 1999:73; cf. Varonis and Gass 1985 whose investigation concluded that NNS talk more to other NNS than to NSs).

18. This ability can be somewhat diminished for NSs in CLEs, since NNSs can, from time to time, interfere with this process.

19. It should be noted that certain types of interactions tend to show "elective affinity" (Schegloff 1996) for the use of particular grammatical constructions. That is, certain discourse will naturally contain particular types of utterances (cf. Hatch 1992). For example, service encounters would be likely to include requests, offers, refusals, suggestions, excuses, elaborations or justifications for why some action cannot be performed, all of which fall under the heading of face-threatening acts (FTAs). On the other hand, free conversation can contain utterances of any type as well as a mixture of FTAs and face-saving actions (FSAs), depending on the topic under discussion.

20. Accommodation theory originally had only an addressee focus, that is, it considered only the productive capabilities of the speaker. Not to be forgotten is the 'receptive competence' (Coupland. Coupland, Giles and Henwood 1988) of the NNS, which may far exceed a NNS's ability to produce.

21. Day et al. (1984) take issue with Varonis and Gass (1983) who invoke the terms 'push down' and 'pop up' for the beginning and ending of side sequences, which they see as halting the flow of conversation.

22. Glenn (1989:137) sees laughing at one's own laughable material as 'engaging in self-praise, akin to a public speaker applauding herself for making an effective oratorical point.' Althouth his is plausible, it certainly does not always true.

23. Misunderstanding is even more common in cross-language encounters.

24. See Jefferson (1994) for a further discussion of responses to speaker laughter where she uses the terms 'laugh-receptive' and 'laugh resistant.'

25. According to Provine (1996:41), "people are about thirty times more likely to laugh when they are in a social situation than when they are alone."

26. Teasing can, however, set up a laughing *at* rather than a laughing *with* relationship that has the potential for creating a hostile situation.

27. This strategy might be preferred by NNSs of lower proficiency levels.

28. The degree of cooperation between interlocutors has been shown to have a direct bearing on the outcome of a given interaction (cf. Brenneis 1986; Duranti 1986; Stewart and Pearson 1995; Stewart 1996a).

29. This act of evaluating another's talk can certainly be an FTA, but laughter can mitigate its force.

CHAPTER 3

REPETITION IN CLEs

3.1 Functions of Repetition in CLEs

As noted in Chapter 1, repetition is a multi-functional resource in language that occurs at multiple linguistic levels and can be used to accomplish a variety of communicative acts. In general, the use of repetition calls attention to the special nature of the material without changing the referential meaning of the utterance.[1] Ubiquitous across all language genres, repetition can be immediate or displaced, exact or non-exact, invoked by self or others, and can be used to empower or disempower (refer to Sec. 2.6.1 for a discussion of power in CLEs). Repetition is found in the speech of both NSs and NNSs, not only in CLEs but also in native language interactions. As long as it is not used to excess, repetition can be a sustainer of conversation, a real asset to those involved in CLEs.

Repetition serves a variety of purposes in all spoken interaction (Brody 1986; Johnstone 1987, 1994a, 1994b; Ochs 1975; Tannen 1987c, 1989). Tannen (1989) identifies five levels on which repetition functions: 1) production, 2) comprehension, 3) discourse, 4) interpersonal, and 5) interactional. Repetition used as a production tactic

affords speakers the ability to produce semi-fluent speech "in a more efficient, less energy-draining way" (p. 48) while formulating upcoming remarks. When employed as a comprehension tactic, especially for NNSs in CLEs, repetition facilitates understanding by recycling given information rather than introducing new material. Recycling is often particularly advantageous for NNSs, as it affords them additional processing time. As a general discourse strategy, repetition provides cohesion between current utterances and prior discourse (cf. Halliday and Hasan 1976). Because repetition is also an interactional phenomenon, it can be manipulated by speakers to achieve a variety of social goals including the phatic goal of social solidarity. On an interpersonal level, for example, repetition can function to display an interlocutor's "involvement" (Tannen 1989) in the current interaction. The following sections containing examples from my data illustrate the above-mentioned facets of repetition and show how productive repetition can be for both NSs and NNSs involved in CLEs.

3.2 Repetition as a Production Mechanism

As discussed in Chapter 2, Vygotsky and his disciples introduced a radical change in thinking about language development. Rather than understanding language development as a monologic to dialogic progression, the Soviets' social approach to speech suggested just the

opposite (dialogic to monologic) and necessarily involved interaction with other human beings. As support for their argument, they offered activity theory, combined with the notions of ZPD and PCA (refer to Sec. 2.4, page 60 and 62, respectively).

According to Vygotsky, speech production originates with thought and is completed in the spoken word. Interlocutors' utterances comprise a coherent text which is the result of their continuous social interaction. Vygotsky's notion of dialogic speech is twofold. In the most basic stage, where no new or creative activity is required, a speaker repeats or reproduces a part of the question or prior utterance (Luria 1981:149), a process also known as scaffolding (Slobin 1982; Donato 1994, Vygotsky 1986).

3.2.1 Dialogic Speech - Phase I

In the process of scaffolding, NNSs build their utterance off those of their interlocutor. Scaffolding, therefore, necessarily contains other-repetition. The following examples of repetition, which involve NNSs of different proficiency levels, show them both to be engaged in the most elementary level of dialogic speech. Repetition in these instances functions as a tactic (de Certeau 1984) for beginning L2 speakers.

In the first, the NNS uses a large part of the NS's utterance to formulate her own:

Example 1/from Discourse Sample #2A:

2NS: *Necesito una cita.*
I need an appointment.

3NNS: *Sí. ¿A qué hora necesita una cita?*
Yes, at what time do you need an appointment?

The NNS adopts the NS's exact construction *(necesito una cita) from 2*, changing the verb for for person only (to *necesita una cita*) to develop her own utterance in 3. This use of repetition is highly effective for keeping the conversation going, and appears as fluent speech emanating from the NNS.

While scaffolding can involve merely adopting another's words, speakers can adopt, then expand on, their interlocutors' utterances as well, as shown in an example from the free conversation:

Example 2/from DS #9C:

74NSM: *Sabes montar a caballo: S.?*
Do you know how to ride horses, S.?

75NNS: *He montado a caballo varios, varias veces.*
I have ridden horses several, several times.

Here, I borrow a portion of the NS's utterance (*montar a caballo*), conjugating the verb (*he montado a caballo*) in order to formulate my answer to the question. This example differs from the previous one, however, in that I move to a more complex verb form (present perfect), diplaying my more advanced proficiency.

As speakers become more comfortable in their use of the L2, they are able to engage in more complex types of production. As they do so, they move into another stage of dialogic speech.

3.2.2 Dialogic Speech - Phase II

In the second phase of dialogic speech identifed by Vygotsky, which is somewhat more involved, an interlocutor responds to specific statements or questions by actively searching for a response or answer from a variety of alternatives. It is not at all surprising, then, that self-repetition would be a part of the process.

In the example below, the NNS responds to the NS's utterance with words of his own:

Example 3/from DS #1A:

5NS: *Necesito un corto de pelo para mañana.*
I need a haircut tomorrow.

6NNS: *Ok. Uh:, ¿Cuánto, uh, cuánto tiempo?*
Ok, Uh:, How much, uh, how much time?

7NS: *Eh, no sé.*
Eh, I don't know.

Necesito que me lo corte bien.
I need for you to cut it well.

Entonces, no sé cuánto tiempo le lleve Ud. pero,
So, I don't know how much time it takes you but,

¿a qué hora puede darme Ud. un cor-,
what time can you give me a cu-,

una cita para cortarme el pelo?
an appointment to cut my hair?

In responding to the NS's indirect question in 5, the NNS asks 'how much' time, stumbling on the interrogative word.

It may be that he is reaching for the word *cuándo*, 'when,' to formulate a question about when the NS, who is role-playing the customer, wants the appointment and suddenly realizes that he cannot access the word. The result is that he has to construct a different question with the similar-sounding *cuánto* and be content with 'how much.' The NS responds to his question, saying that he doesn't know how much time the haircut will require -- after all, that is usually determined by the stylist, the role the NNS is taking. Thus he has to has to re-pose his original question in the subsequent part of his turn, since he does not receive the information he is looking for, which is about when the NNS, in the role of hairstylist, has free times. The flexibility of the NNS in being able to construct even a semi-adequate answer illustrates his ability to make a selection among alternatives; when he couldn't immediately locate *cuándo*, he opted for *cuánto* in an appropriate, if not ideal, fashion.

The next example is a continuation of the same interaction, containing yet another example of self-repetition by the NNS, which clearly shows that he is functioning at a more advanced level of dialogic speech:

Example 4/from DS #1A:

7NS: ... *¿a qué hora puede darme Ud. un cor-,*
when can you giveme a cu-.

una cita para cortarme el pelo?
an appointment to cut my hair?

8NNS: *Sí. Um, uh, ((clears throat)), um,*
Yes. Um, uh, um

yo tengo uh, las citas, uh:
I have uh, appointments, uh:

yo, uh, yo tengo las citas por uh,
I, uh, I have appointments for uh,

diez y media a doce.
10:30 and 12:00.

Here, the NNS does not really rely at all on the NS's question to formulate his reponse, repeating from the question only the lexical item *cita*. Instead, he responds to the NS's question using an original construction to verbalize his thoughts. His affirmative response (*sí*) in 8, which seems to be acknowledgement of his willingness to find a suitable time, may also be confirmation to himself that he is going to have to formulate a response and is anticipating some difficulty on his own part, which is expressed in his several hesistations. Finally he begins his utterance by saying *yo tengo las citas*, then falters again. When he continues, he repeats the phrase *yo tengo las citas* before completing the offering of his free times. This example clearly illustrates what Vygotsky meant when he said that speech production proceeds from thought to word, illustrating that self-repetition is part of the process in between.

The following example shows self-repetition by a NNS who is also seen to have moved past the initial phase of dialogic speech:

Example 5/from DS #4A:

12NS: *¿Podría ser a las doce en la hora de mi almuerzo?*
Could it be at 12:00 at the lunch hour?

13NNS: *Almuerzo, no, yo, ah, yo come mi almuerzo, eh,*
Lunch, no, I, ah, I eat (SUBJ) my lunch, eh,

once, uno hora. One o'clock, um,
eleven, one (MASC) hour (FEM).

This example contains two examples of self-repetition, one of the subject pronoun and the other as an attempt at stating clock time. The repetitions of *almuerzo* from the NS's question is largely a factor of continuity in the theme of the interaction. The self-repetition of *yo* may be in anticipation of having trouble with constructing the verb agreement that follows. Over the course of the utterance, the NNS apparently recognizes that the form he's using is incorrect, so he resorts to his L1 to clarify his intention, which is 1:00 as opposed to one hour.

The next example of self-repetition is somewhat different from the previous one in that the NNS notices after the fact that there is something not right with her utterance:

Example 6/from DS #8B:

15NNS: *... Tambien soy libre desde a uno.*
I'm also free from to one.

Desde, desde la una.
Until one.

Here, the NNS completes her first utterance with declarative intonation. Afterwards, she realizes that she has uttered a non-target form and uses self-repetition to

grammatically alter her original utterance. The self-repetition of *desde* seems to keep her going in the L2 until she achieves her goal of reaching the targeted syntactic construction.

Repetition can also precede abandonment of utterances. The next example shows the use of repetition as part of the NNS's attempt to construct an utterance before giving up and pursuing a different thought:

Example 7/from DS #7B:

12NNS: *Uh, um: yo tenga, uh yo tenga, uh,*
Uh, um: I have (SUBJ), uh, I have (SUBJ), uh.

No, no es bueno, um, ((sigh))
No, it's not good, um,

¿Manaña?
Tomorrow?

Here, the NNS stumbles through his utterance, using exact repetition as a production tactic before making an assessment of the situation and invoking an interrogative, which turns the floor over to the NS. As the NNS realizes that he cannot complete his thought as he would have preferred to, he turns to the NS for assistance, relinquishing the floor with his question.

Further along the continuum of speakers' production capability, as identified by Vygotsky, is monologic speech. The next section provides examples of NNSs engaged in this more progressed stage of production.

3.2.3 Monologic Speech

Monologic speech involves the formulation of a speaker's own thoughts. Although further developed, monologic speech can undoubtedly contain repetition and certainly does not preclude it. The following examples illustrate repetition in the speech of a fairly proficient intermediate speaker and a more advanced NNS.

In the example below, the NNS uses repetition to verbalize her proposition to resolve their joint problem:

Example 8/from DS #7B:

22NNS: *NO. La salón, ah, la salón es, uh,*
No. The salon, ah, the salon is, uh,

¿cómo se dice "closed"?
How do you say closed?

23NS: *Está cerra(d)o.*
It is closed.

24NNS: *¿Está cerra(d)o?*
It is closed?

25NS: Yes.

26NNS: *a las cinco.*
at 5:00.

27NS: Um-hm.

28NNS: *Me, me daré un telefóno de mi hermana,*
I, I will give me my sister's telephone (number)

y ella es una pelostilisto.
and she is a hairstylist.

This is an example of monologic speech from the service encounter. Although the thought in 28 is uttered with some difficulty by the NNS, it nonetheless communicates complex ideas. After declining the NS's offer of coming in after

5:00 offered in an earlier turn as a solution to their dilemma of conflicting schedules (acceptance of his solution would have been the easy thing to do), she formulates an imaginative idea of how to handle the problem. She experiences grammatical, pronunciation and lexical difficulties in 28: a problem with the indirect object (*me* instead of *te*), utters the word for 'telephone' with Anglicized pronunciation, and uses an interesting blending of English and Spanish to create a word for 'hairstylist.' Another NNS might have stopped with the repetition of *me* at the beginning of the utterance, realizing the agreement problem and allowing it to paralyze her. However, this NNS forges ahead, undaunted by the multitude of problems, and achieves communication.

Repetition also occurs in the speech of more proficient NNSs, as illustrated by the example from the free conversation below:

Example 9/from DS #9C:

97NNS: *Cuando andaba regresando de noche,*
When I was coming back after dark

de la universidad el otro día,
from the university the other day,

cuando el guardián me dejó salir de la puerta,
when the guard let me out of the gate

me dijo, me dijo, uh, "Mucho cuida(d)o.
he told me, he told me, uh, "Be very careful.

¡Hay mucho ladrón por aquí!"
There are lots of thieves around here!"

These lines are the beginning of my nomination of a new topic of conversation. In 97, I use repetition as a means of gathering my thoughts for the upcoming utterance.

3.2.4 Interactive Repetition

The previous examples have illustrated repetition as a production tactic confined to speakers' own utterances, without any outside assistance or intervention from hearers. The following examples involve repetition of an interactive nature, that is, instances of repetition which invite or invoke help from others.

In the first example, the NNS uses a direct question to elicit the missing lexical item from the NS:

Example 10/from DS #7B:

18NNS: Uh, um, la salón es fini a las cinco.
Uh, um, the salon is fini at 5:00.

22NNS: ... *La salón, ah, la salón es, uh,*
... The salon, ah, the salon is, uh,

¿cómo se dice "closed"?
How do you say 'closed'?

23NS: *Está cerra(d)o.*
It is closed.

24NNS: *¿Está cerra(d)o?*
It is closed?

25NS: Yes.

The NNS repeats the phrase *la salón* from 18 in 22. Her first repetition seems to be to establish *la salón* as the common topic, a frequent and inevitable occurrence in conversation. Her second repetition is indicative of her awareness that she lacks the appropriate lexical item. She

has used an approximation in 18, but now recognizes that it is deviant and seems compelled to find the target form. Consequently, she makes a direct request for assistance in the next part of her utterance. When the NS complies with her request in 23, she repeats his offering with rising intonation in 24 to confirm that what she heard was correct. Note his confirmation in 25 in her L1.

Requests for lexical assistance may be indirect as well, as illustrated by the following example:

Example 11/from DS #8B:

37NNS: OK, uh, hac- ah,
OK, uh, ma-, ah,

((whispered)) I don't know how to say un appoint-

38NS: *Cita.*
Appointment.

39NNS: *¿Cita?* Hace, wait, uh, una cita ...
Appointment? Make, wait, uh, an appointment ...

In 37, the NNS makes an indirect request for assistance (whispered in her L1), and the NS complies in 38, anticipating what his interlocutor needs before she even completes her utterance. The NNS repeats *cita* in 39, but what distinguishes this example from the similar exchange above is that the NNS actually includes the new word in her attempt to construct a sentence, thus demonstrating her ability to use the new information. The NNS's utterance involves scaffolding, as she adopts the single lexical item used by the NS in 38.

3.2.5 NSs' Use of Repetition in Production

Of course repetitious speech is not confined to NNSs. As Vygotsky's principle of continuous access suggests, speakers may, at any time, move back and forth among the various levels, depending upon the particular communicative situation. Other-repetition was found as to function as a scaffolding device as NNSs built their utterances off their NS interlocutors. Self-repetition occurred as NSs formulated their upcoming utterances.

In the next two examples, repetition is displayed in the speech of NSs, portraying customers in the role-play task. In both, it is employed as a strategy to "buy time" in order to formulate counter offers for a possible time for their hair appointment.

Scaffolding is present in the speech of a NS, as illustrated by the following example:

Example 12/from DS #6B:

29NNS: *Pero no, no tengo, no tengo que comer,*
But, I don't , I don't have, I don't have to eat,

¿entiendes?
do you understand?

No es importante para mí.
It's not important for me.

30NS: *Ah, no es importante para ti.*
Ah, it's not important for you.

Ah, ok. *Para mí, sí,* @@@@@@@@@@@@
Ah, ok. For me it is, @@@@@@@@@@@@

In 30, the NS builds his repsonse almost completely off that of the NNS, adding only the discourse marker "ah" and

adapting the object of the preposition for person (*mí* to *ti*). The NNS, in the role of hairdresser, offers to skip lunch in order to achieve the role-play goal of the task, giving the NS a hair appointment. The repetition is further used as a contrastive device by the NS who subsequently states that eating lunch is very important to him.

Repetition can occur after the rejection of an offer in the formulation of a counter offer. In the example below, the NS declines the offer made by the NNS, first explaining why he cannot come at the suggested time, then offering an alternative time:

Example 13/from DS #1A:

21NNS: Okay. Um, *¿el hora uh, para, ... (3.0)*
OK. Um, the hour uh, for,

nueve a diez?
9:00 to 10:00?

22NS: *No puedo.*
I can't.

Tengo que trabajar.
I have to work.

¿Qué tal, qué tal a las once de la mañana?
How about, how about 11:00AM?

The NS's first strategy is to diffuse the force of his rejection of the time offered by the NNS. In a subsequent utterance, he self-repeats *qué tal* in the process of selecting an alternative slot for the appointment based on his schedule.

Example 14/from DS #6B:

13NNS: *¿Pero no dos y media?*
But not at 2:30?

14NS: *No, no a las dos y media,*
No, not at 2:30

porque a las dos y media,
because at 2:30

tengo una reunión con mi jefe.
I have a meeting with my boss.

15NNS: Ok,

16NS: *¿Quizás a las, a las tres y media?*
Perhaps at, at 3:30?

Much as in example 13, the NS uses self-repetition of *a las* as a production strategy in the formulation of his utterance.

3.2.6 Summary

This section has described repetition as a production tactic and strategy highlighting Vygotsky's dialogic to monologic progression of speech development along the scaffolding of the ZPD. In the most basic stage of dialogic speech, NNSs were shown to use other-repetition in both simple (example #1) and more complex (example #2) ways. In the later stage of dialogic speech, NNSs demonstrated the use of self-repetition both within their own utterances (examples #3 - #5) and after completion of their utterance (example #6). Self-repetition also occurred prior to utterance abandonment (example #7). Repetition also occurred in monologic forms of speech by NNSs (examples #8 and #9). Repetition of an interactive

nature was seen in examples #10 and #11, as the NNSs elicited missing lexical items from their interlocutors.

As a production strategy, repetition was not confined to the speech of NNSs. It was used by NSs as a scaffolding device (example #12) as well as in the formulation their upcoming thoughts (examples #13 and #14).

3.3 Repetition as a Comprehension Device

The second area of discourse identified by Tannen (1989) that benefits from repetition is comprehension, Repetition promotes understanding by including old, or given, information. Repetition can serve as a a confirmation check for both NSs and NNSs. In addition, repetition can provide the NNSs with extra processing time when dealing with unknown information or when having difficulties in interpretation without obviously sacrificing fluency. Repetition can also be used by NNSs and NSs in the repair of utterances.

3.3.1 Repetition as a Confirmation Check

Because CLEs are such fertile grounds for misunderstanding, confirmation checks are frequent occurrences. In the example from the free conversaton below, I use repetition of the NS's previous offering preceded by an exclamatory:

Example 15/from DS #9C:

152NSM: *??? Van a dar nada más cada mes*
??? They are going to give no more than

siete horas de conversación
7 hours of conversation each month

por lo que tú pagas ...
for what you pay ...

.
.
.

160NNS: [¿Pero, de:larga distancia o?
But, of long distance or?

161NSM: No, local.
No, local.

162NNS: [*Sh@@@@it*. ¿Siete horas? No@@@o.
Shit. Seven hours? No.

163NSCl: [Siete horas
7 hours

164NSMon: [al mes
per month

Here is an example of displaced repetition (from 152 by NS to 162 by NNS) used as a confirmation check, because I cannot believe what I have just heard. It is followed by an echo of repetition from the two girls as confirmation of the allotted amount of time.

Repetition often follows a request for clarification, as illustrated by another example from the free conversation:

Example 16/Situation #9C:

166NNS: *Hay que conseguir* "call waiting," *entonces*.
It's necessary to get call waiting, then.

167JM: *¿Cómo es?*
What's that?

168NNS: "Call waiting," @@@@@ [@@@@

169NSJM: [*¿Cómo se hace?*
How does it work?

170NNS: *Parece como dos lineas=*
It's like having two lines=

171NSM: *=dos lineas=*
=two lines=

172NNS: *=con un número=*
=with one number=

173NSM: *=con un número. Claro.*
=with one number. Sure.

Sí, éso es lo que tenemos que hacer.
Yes, that's what we have to do...

In this excerpt I use self-repetition to explain and two NSs use repetition, one to ask for clarification and the other to confirm my explanation of the unfamiliar concept that I have introduced. I use the same L1 lexical item, call waiting, in 168 that I did in 166, eliciting a second question, this time from NSM in 169. Then NSM repeats my offering with declarative intonation to give herself time to process the new information, then agrees with me at the end.

Repetition can also be useful for NNSs to confirm lexical assistance received in response to requests for assistance, as shown in the following examples from the service encounters. In the first, the NNS makes a direct request of the NS:

Example 16/from DS #7B:

22NNS: *¿cómo se dice "closed"?*
how do you say "closed"?

23NS: *Está cerra(d)o.*
It is closed.

24NNS: *¿Está cerra(d)o?*
¿Está cerra(d)o?

25NS: Yes.

26NNS: *a las cinco.*
at 5:00.

When the NS answers her question, the NNS repeats the phrase to make sure she heard it correctly. Her repetition in 24 matches that of the NS phonologically as well as lexically.

Both clarification and correction are found in the following task-oriented example, where the NS uses repetition to confirm adjusments made in prior turns, as illustrated by the following example:

Example 18/from DS #8B:

13NNS: *Uh, soy, uh, libre a nueve y diez @@@@@@ a diez.*
Uh, I am, uh, free at 9 to 10 @@@@@@ to 10.

14NS: *Nueve a diez.*
9 to 10.

But, pero, pero yo tengo trabajo a las nueve.
But, but, but I have work at 9.

The NNS self-corrects in 13 and NS repeats the adjusted time phrase *nueve a diez* in 14, then tells her why that isn't an acceptable time for him. The second part of his utterance begins with a discourse marker in English,[2] but he switches to Spanish and repeats the word *pero* before continuing his explanation.

3.3.2 Repetition to Initiate Repair

Repetition can also be used as a repair-initiator. In CLEs, this type of repetition would most likely, but

certainly not exclusively, be found in the turns of NSs. In the following task-based example, the NS questions the NNS's prior use of the word *mucho*:

Example 19/from DS #2A:

35NNS: *Sí señorita, por muchos dinero @@@@*
Yes ma'am, for much (PL) money (SG).

36NS: *¿Mucho?*
Much (SG)?

37NNS: *Sí, por mucho dinero yo esperó para Ud.*
Yes, for much (SG) money I wait (PAST) for you.

38NS: *@@@@ ¿Mucho dinero?*
Much money?

39NNS: *Sí.*
Yes.

The NS's utterance of *mucho* can be interpreted in two ways: 1) as a normal response in a NS/NS encounter in which the utterance would most likely be interpreted as a request for further information (How much?), or 2) as a correction of the NNS's error in number (plural instead of singular) in 35, or both. Regardless, the NNS notices the NS's alteration and incorporates the modified form into her own utterance in 37. The NS uses an exact repetition in 38 as an interrogative to serve as an additional request for information. The NNS is unable to interpret it as such, due perhaps to her underdeveloped pragmatic competence, and answers the question as a yes/no in 39. Not until much later (53) does the NS receive the answer she was looking for -- thirty dollars in total for the cut plus tip.

In the following example, the NS is questioning more than a mere piece of morphology -- she needs clarification of an entire phrase:

Example 20/from DS #1A:

29NNS: *Um...uh, una hora libre uh, por doce a once?*
Um, uh, an hour free, uh, for 12 to 11?

30NS: *¿Doce a, a once o doce a una?*
12 to, to 11 or 12 to 1?

31NNS: *Doce a una.*
12 to 1.

In 29 the NNS stumbles through his utterance, hesitating at first, then again before stating the available time slot. The NS then uses repetition to question what the NNS has said, figuring that he has confused the clock hours. She, too, hesitates in mid-utterance, perhaps at that moment deciding at that moment to offer him an option as oppsed to correcting him outright, thus offering the NNS a face-saving opportunity. The NNS rectifies his prior utterance when he selects the appropriate clock hours from the options presented in 31 and repeats them.

Especially within the set task, repetition serves to orient the NS and NNS in the shared world of their task. In the very confusing interaction below, the NS does not understand the NNS's use of a particular lexical item and uses repetition to question what she is trying to say:

Example 21/from DS #3A:

14NNS: Uh, no: um you, um, *vaya, ¿vaya?*
Uh, no: un you, um, go, go?

15NS: *¿Vaya?*
Go?

16NNS: *Vaya, vaya a las, um,*
Go, go at, um,

17NS: *No, venga.*
No, come.

After much hesitation, the NNS selects a motion verb *vaya*, then repeats it with rising intonation to indicate the uncertainty with which she has used it. The NS's repetition, also with rising intonation, indicates his non-comprehension of her choice in this particular context. Her evolving syntax in 16 (which includes the prepositional phrase *a las*) clues the NS into what she is searching for and he supplies it in 17.

The previous example centered on word. In the next example from the free conversation, the NS repeats, then rephrases, one of my utterances in its entirety:

Example 22/from DS #9C:

99NNS: *Uh, favor de:de pararse allá y cuidar [me, @@@@.*
Uh, please stop there and take care of me, @@@,

100NSC: [@@@@@@

101NSMon: [@@@@@@

102NSM: [@@@@@@

¿Favor de pararse allá y cuidarme? @@@@@@
Please stop there and take care of me?

Vigílame desde allí.
Watch me from there.

This excerpt comes from my story about an interaction I had with a guard at the university. In 102, NSM rephrases what

I have said in 99 in a more locally appropriate manner. Although I am able to convey my message, I use a stilted command form, *favor de* + infinitive, *cuidarme*. NSM's rephrasal used the informal command form of a better suited verb, *vigilar*, 'to watch.' NSM is able to suggest a more appropriate utterance to me in a most non-threatening way, despite the fact that any correction or suggestion of a different or better word constitutes an FTA to my negative face. At no time does she say - "No, you have to say it this way" (cf. Fairclough 1989); she just offers a more satisfactory rephrasal of what I have said originally.

3.3.3 Pragmatic Uses of Repetition

Pragmatically, repetition can be employed when a speaker anticipates interactional difficulty on the part of the hearer. NSs may often choose to repeat all or part of an utterance in order to ensure a interlocutor's comprehension.

In the following example, the NS repeats in 54 what he had said in 52, despite an affirmative response from the NNS in 53:

Example 23/from DS #1A:

52NS: *¿Me anotas?*
You've got me down?

53NNS: *S [í.*
Yes.

54NS: *[¿Me anotas?*
You've got me down?

55NNS: *Mi notas.*
My notes.

Escribir en el, escribo, escribo en el libro.
To write in the, I write, I write in the book.

56NS: OK.

The NS's question in 52 obviously contains an unfamiliar verb for the NNS. Even though he responds in the affirmative in 53, there is undoubtedly some confusion indicated on his part, perhaps through his intonation, since the NS reposes the exact question in 54. The NNS's inexact repetition in 54 demonstrates his imprecise understanding of the verb phrase, yet he does manage to get that it has to do with writing the appointment down, as he expands in the next part of his turn. The NS's response in 56 shows that he finds the rephrasing to indicate satisfactory comprehension.

Repetition occurs in the following example, even though there is no reason for it other than the phatic:

Example 24/from DS #5B:

30NS: *Ok. Está bien.*
Ok. That's good.

Vuelvo mañana a las diez y media.
I'll come back tomorrow at 10:30.

Entonces, mañana a las diez y media.
Then, tomorrow at 10:30.

Here, the NS uses immediate repetition to make sure that the NNS understands and is in agreement with the 10:30 time slot. This is also a politeness move, which is also common in leave-taking in conversational Spanish.

Repetition may immediately follow an utterance or, as in the example below, may be displaced across several utterances:

Example 25/from DS #6B:

8NS: *A las dos y media tengo una reunión con el jefe,*
At 2:30 I have a meeting with the boss,

con mi jefe,
with my boss,

a las dos y media.
at 2:30.

9NNS: *Pero, uh, ¿doce y media está bien?*
But, uh, 12:30 is good?

10NS: *¿Doce y media? Tampoco.*
Not 12:30 either.

With displaced repetition of the time phrase *a las dos y media*, the NS reinforces the that his meeting at 2:30 would preclude their setting an appointment at that time. Obviously this is an effective strategy, as the NNS proposes an alternative time in his subsequent utterance.

Displaced repetition may be prompted by other motives. In the following example, repetition is preceded by circumlocution as the NS attempts to explain her prior utterance to the NNS:

Example 26/from DS #2A:

46NS: *¿Cuánto sería en total?*
How much will it be in all?

La propina más el corto de pelo,
The tip plus the haircut.

¿cuánto sería en total?
How much will it be in all?

In this utterance, the NS uses circumlocution in between instances of exact repetition in an attempt to explain herself. Obviously she anticipates a comprehension problem that may need explanation, accounting for the additional wording and the repetition of her initial offering.

3.3.4 Repetition as Clarification

Repetition may also occur as clarification mechanism, or as a response to a request for clarification. Like immediate repetition, displaced repetition need not involve precisely the same words.

In the following example, the NS uses inexact repetition to further explain herself after the NNS has misunderstood:

Example 27/from DS #2A:

4NS: *Bueno, mañana tengo el horario ocupado,*
Well, tomorrow I have a busy schedule,

pero estoy libre de once a doce,
but I'm free from 11:00 to 12:00

de tres a cuatro,
from 3 until4

o de cinco en adelante a cualquier hora.
or from 5:00 on.

5NNS: *Doce es muy bueno para mí.*
12:00 is good for me.

6NS: *Pero a las doce tengo un compromiso.*
But at 12:00 I have an appointment.

A las doce no puedo.
At 12:00 I can't.

¿De las once a las doce?
From 11:00 to 12:00?

¿A las once?
At 11:00?

¿Cómo está tu horario?
How is your schedule?

Here, the NS clarifies in 6 what she has already said in 4. There are instances of exact and inexact repetition as well as rephrasal in order to ensure the NNS's comprehension.

Some variation in repetition, however, is usually a good thing, as demonstrated above because, as Johnstone (1994a) notes, exact repetition is rarely an effective means of getting one's message across, especially in a situation where trouble is likely to exist (e.g. CLEs). Below, over the course of several turns, the NS repeats the phrase *mi nombre* over and over again, without ever achieving comprehesion on the part of the NNS:

Example 28/from DS #4A:

22NS: *Tengo que dar mi nombre.*
I have to give my name.

.
.
.

24NS: *Ud. necesita mi nombre ... Mi nombre,*
You need my name ... my name,

.
.
.

26NS: *Mi nombre es A.*
My name is A.

27NNS: *Es no bueno.*
It's no good.

The NS starts in 22 wanting to leave her name -- a natural part of the appointment schema they have been assigned; yet by 27, the NNS is still confused about what she is trying

to tell him. Although she uses the phrase as both subject and object with several different verbs, her insistence on exact repetition may have been her communicative downfall. At no point does she ever use the more familiar *me llamo* construction or say anything about writing it down in order to let the NNS know what she wants him to do.

Repetition can be used along with expansion as a teaching mechanism. In the following excerpt from the free conversation, the NSs use repetition to clarify newly-presented lexical information.

Example 29/from DS #9C:

105NNS: ... Y andaba con palo [grande.
... And I had a big stick.

.
.
.

109NSM: ... Con un pedazo de palo, @@@@ ...
... With a piece of stick, @@@@ ...

.
.
.

122NSM: *Eso es un garrote=*
That is a garrote=

=lo que tú traías.
=what you were carrying.

¿Sabes qué es un garrote?
Do you know what a garrote is?

.
.
.

125NSM: *Ese palo se llama un garrote.*
That stick is called a garrote.

126NNS: *¿Garrote?*
Garrote?

.
.
.

131NSJM: *[El palo que tenía el Presidente Roosevelt*
[The stick that President Roosevelt had

132NNS: [@@@@@@@,

Walk softly and carry a big heh stick @@ [@@@@,

133NSJM: [@@@@@,

éso es un garrote.
that's a garrote.

139NSM: [@@@@, *garrote.*

.
.
.

140JM: ... *pero tenía un garrote abrochado, ...*
... but he held a big stick over them ...

In 105, I use the Mexican term *palo*[3] to refer to a stick. In 109 NSM and 125NSJM also use the word, to show understanding. This shared knowledge, which "facilitates coordination between particpants in their verbal interaction" (Ng and Bradac 1993:168), serves as a springboard for NSM to introduce the word more commonly used in the Dominican Republic, *garrote*. NSM and NSJM go through a series of statements (through 140) to explain to me precisely what the word means. I repeat it in 126 (as a confirmation check), and in 132 I state the often-quoted line in English. While they did not oppose my use of a dialectical variant, the NSs took advantage of the opportunity to teach me, as a NNS, a new word and did so in a very accommodating way.

While the above example contains instances of repetition to explain and reinforce a new lexical item, repetition may also occur in response to a request to

explain an unknown lexical item or clarify an utterance that was not understood. Below, in an excerpt from a service encounter, repetition form a part of the NS's response to the NNS's request for repetition:

Example 30/from DS #3A:

14NS: *Mañana.*
Tomorrow.

Urgentemente porque tengo un viaje de negocios.
Urgently, because I have a business trip.

15NNS: *Repita, por favor.*
Repeat, please.

16NS: *Tengo un viaje de negocios el próximo día.*
I have a business trip the next day.

Después de mañana tengo un viaje de negocios,
The day after tomorrow I have a business trip,

y necesito cortarme el pelo mañana.
and I need to cut my hair tomorrow.

17NNS: *No comprendo.*
I don't understand.

18NS: *Tengo que cortarme el pelo mañana.*
I have to cut my hair tomorrow.

Es urgente. Por favor.
It's urgent. Please.

¿De doce a una Ud. tiene libre?
Are your free from 12:00 to 1:00?

19NNS: *Posible una.*
Possible 1:00.

Porque yo comer.
Because I eat (INF).

Almorzar a las doce.
Eat lunch (INF) at 12:00.

In 14 the NS explains why she must get her hair cut the next day. In 15, the NNS requests repetition due to lack

of comprehension. The NS repeats the phrase *un viaje de negocios* twice in her next turn, altering her syntax as well as varying her lexicon. In 16, she fronts what she believes to be salient -- business trip -- and varies *después de mañana* with *el próximo día*. However, this additional information does not seem to help. Not until 18 where she constructs a completely new utterance that focuses more directly on the task at hand is the NNS able to answer her.

3.3.5 Summary

This section has provided examples of various uses of repetition as a comprehension device: as a strategy for NSs and as a tactic for NNSs. It was used as a confirmation check (examples #15 - #18) and as a repair initiator (examples #19 - #22). Repetition was shown to function pragmatically for NSs both when anticipating interactional difficulty (examples #23 - #24) and when trying to avoid it (examples #25 - #26). Repetition was used to clarify. Exact repetition (example #28) was shown to be much less effective than inexact repetition used with expansion (example #29). Repetition was also employed as a response to request for clarification (example #30).

3.4 Repetition as a Discourse Strategy

In discoure, repetition serves as a cohesive device that links utterances and shows their relationship to prior discourse. This process of repetition-enhanced cohesion is

illustrated by the following excerpts. It should be noted that this particular type of repetition was confined to the free conversation and occurred only in the speech of NSs. The fact that the task-oriented speed was constrained both by the task and by the low-level abilities of NNSs involved in the task precluded the use of discourse strategies.

In the example below, the NS repeats the NNS's words exactly from a previous utterance:

Example 31/from DS #9C:

22NNS: *¡Qué vestido!=*
What a dress!

23NSC: =@@@@@@@@=

24NNS: *=¡qué pierni ſ ta!*
what legs!

.
.
.

34NSM: *... ¡Qué vestido, qué piernita!=*
... What a dress, what legs!

In 34 NSM recaptures my exact words from prior discourse and uses them in a continued discussion of the soap opera characters. While the NSM's precise motives for the repetition are unknown, possibilities include the encouragement of my further language use, and/or perhaps the novelty of my NNS expression -- perhaps she would not have said it that way at all, and my means of description caused her to repeat what I said earlier. This is a good example of Norrick's (1994) notion of playful repetition (cf. discussion of laughter in Chapter 5).

Repetition can be used to indicate familiarity. In the next example, NSM and NSJM repeat the lexical item *palo* over a long number of turns:

Example 32/from DS #9C:

105NNS: *Uh-huh. Y andaba con palo grande.*
Uh-huh. And I had a big stick

.
.
.

109NSM: *... Con un pedazo de palo, @@@@.*
With a piece of stick, @@@

.
.
.

125NSM: *Ese palo se llama un garrote.*
That *palo* (MEX) is called a *garrote* (DOM)

.
.
.

131NSJM: *[El palo que tenía el Presidente Roosevelt,*
The stick that President Roosevelt had

.
.
.

145NSJM: *Un palo, un chingazo, @@@@@@@*
A stick, a whomp, @@@@@@

The word *palo* occurs across a large number of turns. It is used first by me when referring to 'stick.' It is used next by NSM to re-frame what I have said.3 It is subsequently employed three times by NSJM, twice as a teaching mechanism as he introduces the Dominican term for 'stick,' then later as he has a good laugh about my use of the ***mexicanismos***.

3.5 Repetition as an Interactional Device

3.5.1 Openings and Closings

In its most basic form, repetition is often used as the second part of openings and closings (cf. Schegloff and Sacks 1973). Although this might not seem like such an important function, to NNSs of lower proficiency involved in CLEs, this sort of repetition is an invalauble resource to propel the interaction forward. In the first example, repetition is by the NNS.

Example 33/from DS #1A:

1NS: *Buenas tardes.*
Good afternoon.

2NNS: *Buenas tardes.* Uh,
Good afteroon. Uh,

Here, the NNS reiterates the NS's words exactly as part of a formulaic opening, then falters. At least he is able to respond to the greeting before experiencing difficulty.

Repetition is also used in this manner in the following examples of leave-taking by NSs:

Example 34/from DS #1A:

59NNS: *Adi [ós.*
Goodbye.

60NS: *[Adiós.*
[Goodbye.

Example 35/from DS #6B:

65NNS: *Hasta luego.*
Until then.

66NS: Ok. *Hasta luego.*
Ok. Until then.

In both examples above, the NS repeats the NNS's lexical offering as the second part of a formulaic closing to terminate the interaction.

3.5.2 Turn-taking Device

Repetition functions pragmatically in the management of conversation (Brody 1994; Johnstone 1994a, 1994b), a device which, like the usage described above, is not confined to CLEs. In the next two examples, repetition is used by NSs to initiate their turns in conversation:

Example 36/from DS #6B:

9NNS: *Pero, uh, ¿doce y media está bien?*
But, uh. is 12:30 good?

10NS: *¿Doce y media?*
12:30?

Tampoco.
No good either.

Voy a pasar por la ciudad.
I'm going to be out and about the city.

In 10, the NS uses a partial repetition of the NNS's utterance to capture the floor and continue his turn.

In the next example, NSM repeats and expands on NSJM's word from 28 to begin her turn:

Example 37/from DS #9C:

28NSJM: *Fea.*
Ugly.

29NSM: *Fea del carajo pero tiene un cuerpo ...*
Ugly as sin, but she has a body ...

In 29, NSM repeats NSJM's one-word utterance, then adds a few words of her own to formulate her utterance and take her turn.

Partial repetition can be used by NSs or NNSs to initiate a turn. In the following example, repetition functions well for the NNS:

Example 38/from DS #4A:

10NS: *Bueno, yo puedo, no sé si hay disponible*
Well, I can, I don't know if it's possible

para las once y treinta.
at 11:30.

11NNS: *¿Las once y treinta? Ah, no bueno.*
11:30? Ah, no good.

Yo tengo mucho trabajo a once y treinta.
I have a lot of work at 11:30.

Here, the NNS uses exact repetition of the NS's time phrase with an interrogative intonation to begin his utterance; he also uses the exact wording in the next part of his turn. This type of repetition allows the NNS to produce a lengthy semi-fluent utterance.

3.5.3 Joint Productions

Repetition can also occur in the joint production (Ferrara 1992) or collaborative completion of utterances. In such instances, speakers work together to construct an utterance over the course of two or more turns. Consider the following examples in which NSs assist NNSs in the completion of their thoughts:

Example 39/from DS #3A:

33NNS: *A las doce, I have, yo tengo doce y nueve,*
At 12:00. I have, I have 12 and 9

34NS: *Libre, libre.* It means available.
Free, free.

In 34 the NS supplies an appropriate word for the NNS, and repeats it for emphasis, then defines it in the her L1, all in the interest of keeping the conversation moving forward. The NNS in this particular interaction is having great difficulty verbalizing her thoughts in the L2 and requires an inordinate amount of assistance from the NS, much of it in her L1. His frustration with her lack of proficiency is obvious in the tone of his voice.

The NNS in the next example is much more proficient than the one in the prior example. Consequently, the joint production carries a very different tone:

Example 40/from DS 8B#:

27NNS: *Ok, oh. ¿cuándo uh, libres, cuándo, @@@@@@, wait,*
Ok, oh, when, uh, free (pl.), when, @@@@@@,

wait, wait, cuándo uh tienes ... (4.0) libre,
wait, wait, when uh do you have ... free,

28NS: *tiempo*
time

29NNS: *tiempe*

30NS: *tiempo*
time

31NNS: *tiempo libre*
free time

32NS: *Yo tengo tiempo libre todos los días,*
I have free time every day

cinco de la tarde.
5:00 in the afternoon.

Here, the repetition continues over several turns. The NNS repeats cuándo, then uses it, along with the L1 'wait,' also repeated, to stall until she can gather her thoughts. As the NNS's syntax expands over the course of her utterance in 27, from *cuando libres* to *cuando tienes libre*,[4] the NS is able to anticipate the missing lexical item, *tiempo*, which he offers in 28. This exemplifies what Day et al. (1984) term 'NNS-inititated/NS-completed repair' -- conversational help that is required, but not due to a mistake by the NNS. The NNS is simply lacking the necessary lexical item, so the NS anticipates it and offers it to her. Next, the NNS's non-target repetition in 29, *tiempe*,[5] is modified by the NS in 30. In 31 the NNS repeats the word appropriately and links the noun and adjective appropriately, demonstrating evidence of emerging syntax. The NS then uses it in a complete sentence in 32 to reinforce and model the correct form for her, lending support to de Hérédia's (1986) claim that NS's repetition of what the learner says serves to validate the learner's utterances.

In some cases, NSs are seen to be able to anticipate needed lexical items as shown in the following example. This anticipation is certainly aided by the assigned task, but the NNS's created word could actually be interpretable by the NS:

Example 41/from DS #7B:

28NNS: *... ella es una pelostilisto.*
... she is a hairstylist.

¿Cómo se dice "hairstyl [ist"?
How do you say 'hairstylist'?

29NS: *[Peluquera.*
Hairstylist.

Due to the NNS's creative coinage in her prior utterance, the NS is able to anticipate and supply the lexical item needed by the NNS before the end of her turn, lending support to the notion that speakers project their thoughts prior to reaching completion points (Ford and Thompson 1996).

Of course joint productions can involve more than mere lexical assistance. In the example below, the NS offers an entire clause to the NNS, but mitigates it with rising intonation:

Example 42/from DS #7B:

30NNS: *Peluquera. Tambien um, uh, ella, ... (2.0) ella,*
Hairstylist. Also, um, uh, she, ... she,

31NS: *¿Ella puede tener tiempo a cortármerlo?*
She can have time to cut it for me?

32NNS: *Sí.*
Yes.

In an earlier turn, the NNS has asked for the word for 'hairstylist.' When the NS supplies it, she repeats it and then tries to continue what she is saying. She hesitates, so the NS picks up on *ella* to collaboratively complete what

she is trying to say. The NNS's acceptance of his completion in 32 indicates that the anticipation is on target.

3.5.4 Summary

Interactional repetition abounds in the speech of both NSs and NNSs. It constitutes the second part of openings (example #33) and closings (example #34 and #35) and functions as a turn-taking device (examples #36 and #37). Repetition is an integral component of the joint production of utterances, allowing NSs to assist NNSs by offering lexical assistance (examples #39 - #41) and by completing their thoughts (example #42).

3.6 Repetition as an Interpersonal Mechanism

In keeping with Vygotsky and Bakhtin's notion of dialogic language, the use of repetition allows a speaker to display "involvement" (Tannen 1989) by responding to another's utterance and giving evidence of her/his participation in the current interaction. While Gumperz (1982) describes involvement as the linguistic and/or non-verbal behavior displayed by a hearer to respond to a speaker's intentions, Chafe (1985 cited in Tannen 1989:11) sees involvement as a threefold feature of spoken interaction: a) the self-involvment of a speaker, 2) the interpersonal involvement between speaker and hearer, and

3) involvement of a speaker with what is being discussed.[6] Although these foci are different, they are not totally unrelated (Tannen 1989).

Tannen's definition of involvement goes a step further, arguing that "speaking and listening include elements and traces of the other" (1989:12). For Tannen, repetition is one of several strategies that work to create conversational involvement. Repeating words, phrases, or sentences of others a) accomplishes the business of conversation, b) demonstrates a speaker's response to a hearer's utterance, c) offers acceptance of another's utterances, their participation, and them, and d) provides evidence of one's own participation. In a similar vein, Merritt (1994) argues that repetition is associated with attention, since those [of us] engaged in social interaction "want to control the attention of our interlocutors" (p. 31).

Exact repetition of another's words, therefore, demonstrates speakers' attention to prior discourse. In the example below, the NS's exact repetition of the phrase I used in an earlier turn ratifies not only my words, but also my presence, as well as acceptance of my speech:

Example 43/from DS #9C:

22NNS: *¡Qué vestido!=*
What a dress!

23NSC: =M(hhh)mm=

24NNS: *=¡qué piernita!*
what legs!

.
.
.

34NSM: *... ¡Qué vestido!*
What a dress!

¡qué piernita!=
What legs!

35NNS: =ehuh

I comment (in 22 and 24) on the appearance of one of the soap opera characters, evoking a humorous response from NSC. Later, in 34, NSM repeats my words, eliciting laughter from me (see Ch. 5 for an in-depth discusion of laughter).

In the example that follows, which is from later on in the same interaction, partial repetition by NSM of my prior utterance is lexical in nature:

Example 44/from DS #9C:

42NNS: *¡Mira esa rubia!*
Look at that blonde!

43NSJM: ¡Wow!

44NSM: *¡Tremenda rubia!*
Tremendous blonde!

The NS picks up the noun from my turn in 42 and accompanies it with an emphatic adjective.

Repetition can also be used in a playful manner (cf. Norrick 1994). In example 48, self- and other-repetition are used in a playful manner by NSs, showing both

convergence (solidarity since we share this knowledge) and divergence (Mexican and Dominican Spanish are separate varieties) with me:

Example 45/Situation #9C:

148NSJM: ((cantando a la mexicana)) *Nohombre,*
(in a sing-song voice) No way, man

149NSM: *[Nohombre*
No way, man

150NSJM: *[Andale,*

hombre,

los mexicanos sí hablan cantando un poquito;
Mexicans do speak singing a little bit;

dicen, *ándale...*
they say *ándale...*

151 NNS: Uh @@@@@@@ huh.

Over the course of the conversation I have used several lexical items typically associated with Mexican Spanish. Here, NSJM makes an attempt to converge with me on a cultural level by exhibiting his familiarity with the sing-song way in which some Mexicans speak. The lexical item used by NSJM in 148 is repeated by NSM in 149 and used again NSJM in 150 in a joking manner to display the contrast between the Mexican and the Dominican style of speaking Spanish (divergence). The second part of his utterance is delivered in much the same manner, showing repetition of intonation as well. The exchange elicits my laughing agreement.

Repetition can also function on a prosodic level. In the next example are from the free conversation, one NS echoes another:

Example 46/from DS #9C:

62NSMon: *Voy a llorar. Yo voy a llorar.*
I'm going to cry. I'm going to cry.

.
.
.

93NSC: *Y él va a llorar.*
And he's going to cry.

NSC repeats the phrase with the same sing-song imitation that NSMon used many turns earlier, displaying her attention to the interaction.

Repetition can also operate on a phonological level. In the example that follows, the NNS's exact repetition of the NS show that she converging with what he has said (refer to Chapter 2 for a discussion of this aspect of Giles' 1973 accommodation theory) on an accent level:

Example 47/from DS #7B:

22NNS: *¿cómo se dice "closed"?*
how do you say "closed"?

23NS: *Está cerra(d)o.*
It is closed.

24NNS: *¿Está cerra(d)o?*
¿Está cerra(d)o?

The NNS demonstrates a form of accent convergence (Giles 1973) with her repetition in 24, which is phonological as well as lexical, as she mimics the NS's Caribbean pronunciation feature of intervocalic d-deletion.

Phonological repetition can also carry a somewhat derogatory tone. In the next example, the NS mimics the NNS's pronunciation of the newly-coined lexical item:

Example 48/from DS #3A:

103NNS: *So, completo.* (([i], like in English 'complete')) So, finished.

104NS: *Completo* ((identical pronunciation)), *sí, sí, sí.* Finished, yes, yes, yes.

This example contains a different kind of repetition where the NS accommodates to the NNS's pronunciation of this lexical item, a blended approximation which she devises from the English word complete plus the piece of Spanish morphology, -o, which English speakers often assume (sometimes correctly) turns an English word into a Spanish word. In this instance, the NS is almost mocking (Hill 1993) the NNS, displaying his obvious frustration with her low level of proficiency and wanting the task to be over with even sooner than she. It is doubtful, however, that the NNS ever picked up on this derogatory move by the NS. However, this example illustrates what Ferrara means when she says that the use of repetition, instead of being random or one of a number of viable possible alternatives, indicates that "a choice has been made, that some social meaning is being conveyed" (1994:69).

3.7 Summary

As a production device, repetition was found in the speech of both NSs and NNSs, and it functioned both

tactically and strategically (de Certeau 1984). In the first level of dialogic speech described by Vygotsky, repetition functioned as a scaffolding device for NNSs to respond to specific questions or to construct their utterances (examples #1 - #3). In the subsequent phase of dialogic speech, repetition was used in the construction of utterances that were not dependent on those of their interlocutor (examples #3 - #8). An interactional form of repetition was found in the speech of NNS who requested lexical information from their NS counterparts in order to formulate their utterances (examples #13 - #14). Repetition also occurred in the monologic construction of utterances by NNSs (examples #11 - #12). Moreover, repetition was not confined to the speech of NNSs. NSs in this data tended to use repetition as a production device in the formulation of an upcoming utterance (examples #9 - #10).

As a comprehension mechanism, repetition was used as a tactic and as a strategy (de Certeau 1984) in a variety of ways by both NSs and NNSs. Repetition served as a confirmation check (examples #15 - #18) for both NSs and NNSs and as an initiator of repair for NSs (examples #19 - #22). It served to provide NNSs with extra processing time when dealing with unknown information, particularly when NSs anticipated interactional difficulty (examples #23 -

#28). Repetition was also used to clarify, and was initiated by both NSs (example #29) and NNSs (example #30).

As a discourse strategy, repetition exhibited cohesive properties and was confined to the speech of NSs in the free conversation (examples #31 - #32).

As an interactional device, repetition was used by NSs and NNSs in the management of conversation. It functioned well in openings and closings (examples #33 -#35), as a turn-taking device (examples #36 - #38) and in the collaborative completion of utterances (examples #39 -#42).

On an interpersonal note, repetition was used as playful interaction (example #45) and as a means of displaying both convergence and divergence (example #48). Lexical (examples #43 - #44) and intonational (examples #46 - #47) instances of repetition were included that provided evidence of an interlocutor's "involvement" (Tannen 1989) in the interaction.

3.8 End Notes

1. Some languages use morphological, or even lexical, repetition to indicate intensity.

2. See Brody (1991) for a discussion of borrowed discourse markers.

3. See note 13, as well as further discussion of this term in Chapter 5.

4. Note the bound morpheme shift between *libres* and *tienes* (thanks to Hugh Buckingham for this observation).

5. This is an interesting interlanguage slip which obeys a syllable position constraint in anticipation of the upcoming *libre* (thanks to Hugh Buckingham for this observation).

6. Tannen (1989) suggests an additional dimension of involvement of a hearer with what is being discussed.

CHAPTER 4

A VYGOTSKYAN PERSPECTIVE ON REPAIR IN CLEs

4.1 Introduction

Kramsch (1994:11) invokes a territorial metaphor with regards to language learning -- the "geographic annexation of foreign linguistic territory" in order to gain control of an L2, a process which involves grammatical maps and lists of vocabulary words, as well as the goals, strategies and procedures for their implementation. Kramsch's approach is entirely compatible with that of Vygotsky, who proposed the notion of regulation as a means of gaining control of oneself during the learning task (cf. Frawley and Lantolf 1985; Lantolf and Frawley 1985). Kramsch goes a step further as she addresses the notion of how speakers incorporate foreign elements into their own repetoire so that they seem not only less alien but also more personal. Although her discussion focussed on L2 literature, I believe that it is germane to this discussion of the language of CLEs.

Whatever metaphor is used -- geographical annexation, regulation or personal incorporation, the process by which the language learner comes to realize her/his particular L2 voice is a lengthy one. Gaining control of one's L2 voice is an accomplishment that cannot be realized without

concerted effort on the part of the NNS. To use a metaphor from linguistic anthropology, the role of participant observation is invaluable for gaining control of a second language and culture (Brody 1998). In the context of classroom learning, despite many attempts at using other materials, an excellent substitute for participant observation is frequent contact with NSs.

In the L2 acquisition process, a learner acquires both forms and meanings, combining the two to form what Kramsch terms 'emergent meanings' during spoken interaction (cf. Hopper's 1988 notion of 'emergent grammar' discussed in Sec. 1.4). Thus, the relationship between grammar and discourse is 'nonhierarchical' (Larsen-Freeman and Celce-Murcia 1992), i.e. grammar and discourse are complementary forces that shape and influence each other, a viewpoint which is congruous with that of interactional grammar (Ochs, Schegloff and Thompson 1996) in that it considers grammar both a *resource for* and an *outcome of* interaction.

As "language emerges in the process of discourse" (Johnstone 1987:205), the need for negotiation often arises. Negotiation of meaning, which is "a way of providing comprehensible input" (Donato 1994:34) to NNSs, often involves repair. Negotiation and repair (see Sec. 1.6.3) both speak to fact that interlocutors are both observers and participants, and both take the role of speaker and hearer, in the process that is discourse.

For almost two decades, researchers from several disciplines have used a variety of terms to describe discourse as a joint venture between speaker and hearer (Brenneis 1986; Duranti 1986; Ferrara 1992; Goodwin 1979; Schegloff 1982, Vološinov 1926). The term collusion, from the Latin *col-ludere*, which literally means 'a playing together,' is appropriate to describe CLEs. McDermott and Tylbor use a metaphor for conversation, which invokes the comparson of how participants "play into each other's hands, pushing and pulling each other toward a strong sense of what is probable or possible" (1987:154). The notion of conversational collusion highlights the collaborative efforts of interlocutors as they "negotiate conversational structures, establish context, and construct shared meaning" (Green and Harker 1982:191) and recognizes the fact that learning is a social process (Oxford and Nyikos 1997; cf. Vygotsky 1986), ideas which are applicable to the context of CLEs. Social approaches to learning are complementary with a Vygotskyan perspective in general, and are specifically applied to the discussion of repair, which is treated in the upcoming sections.

4.2 Syntax and Repair

Repair is a concept most closely associated with the CA approach. In fact, the initial paper on repair (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977) was authored by three researchers who are today leaders in the field. Schegloff

(1979) speaks to the interdependent relationship between syntax and repair arguing that repair cannot exist without syntax, nor can syntax exist without repair. Obviously, without syntax, there would be no need for repair. Repair is also necessary because speakers frequently make performance errors that make comprehension of their speech difficult. Additionally, a NNS may not know how or be able to decide how to continue, and must be able to access some mechanism by which s/he can stop her/his utterance prior to completion and begin again. Alternatively, when a hearer misunderstands due to an error, the speakers must either be able to point to the error for clarification or be able to fill in on her/his own. Situations calling for the opportunity to repair very commonly occur in the discourse of language learners who are unsure of the structure of their utterances and/or those of their interlocutor(s). Syntax-for-conversation then, recognizes several mechanisms for repair, including same-turn self-repair.

Same-turn self-repair is routine occurrence in speech of both NSs and NNSs. It remains unclear, however, whether NS self-repair is more or less explanatory. That is, it could prove confusing for the NNS. In the example below, a NS pragmatically revises his original thought in mid-utterance:

Example 1/from Discourse Sample #7B:

3NS: ... *Me hace falta, tengo que cortarme el cabello,*
... I need to, I have to cut my hair

y lo necesito, pero tengo el dia muy ocuapdo.
and I need it, but I have a very busy day.

4NNS: OK.

5NS: *¿Cuándo puedes cortarme el cabello?*
When can you cut my hair?

6NNS: Uh, uh, *yo soy,* um, uh, @@@,
Uh, Uh, I am, um @@@,

¿sesenta minutos a las nueve a.m.?
sixty minutes at 9:00AM?

The NS begins the second part of his turn with a low-frequency syntactic construction (*me hace falta*) and changes to one that should be more readily comprehensible by the NNS (*tengo que* + infinitive).[1] He makes this adjustment within the confines of a single turn. The NNS's first response in 4 does not demonstrate her understanding of the NS's prior utterance. Only after he poses a direct question in 5 does he receive an offer for an available time.

The next example shows same-turn repair by a NS, but for a totally different reason.

Example 2/from DS #5B

3NNS: *Um, ¿qué tiempo es bueno para tú?*
Um, what time is good for you?

4NS: *Um, el tiempo, tengo,*
Um, the time, I have,

mis horas libres son de once y treinta a doce,
my free hours are 11:30 to 12:00.

Y ¿cuáles, cuáles son las horas que Ud. tiene,
And, which, which are the times that you have

libres para la cita?
free for the appointment?

5NNS: Um, @@@@@@@, I don't know what you said.

6NS: *Tres horas libres cuándo tú puedes,*
Three free hours when you can

cortarme el cabello.
but my hair.

7NNS: Uh-uh (indicates non-comprehension).

8NS: *¿A qué hora?*
At what time?

¿A qué hora tu puedes darme la cita?
When can you give me the apppointment?

9NNS: Uh, *mis horas son nueve a diez, doce a uno,*
Uh, my hours are 9:00 to 10:00, 12:00 to 1:00,

y no tengo horas completas.
and I don't have full hours.

In 3 the NNS invokes an interrogative and follows it with one of several Spanish words for 'time.' He is clearly understood by the NS who begins his own utterance in 4 with the identical word for 'time,' then alters it twice before settling on mis horas libres, which is a more appropriate expression for clock hours. This is also a good example of scaffolding, providing an alternative that is preferable and giving the NNS a learning opportunity. Unfortunately, the NS's utterances remain incomprehensible to the NNS until he poses a direct, simplified question in 8.

Self-repair within the same turn is not confined to the speech of NSs. In the next example, it is the NNS who makes the adjustment within a single turn:

Example 3/from DS #4A:

9NNS: Bien. ¿Cuánto ah, qué tiempo?
Good. How many ah, what time?

10NS: *Bueno, yo puedo,*
Well, I can,

no sé si hay disponible para las once y treinta.
I don't know if it's possible at 11:30.

11NNS: *¿Las once y treinta? Ah, no bueno,*
11:30? Ah, not good.

Yo tengo mucho trabajo a once y treinta.
I have much work at 11:30.

Here the NNS uses an interrogative[2] and then exchanges it for another and uses, as in the previous example, one of several Spanish words for 'time,' (again, not the appropriate one for clock hours), composing a phrase that is understaood by the NNS, evidenced by her response in 10. (Also, note the alteration in the NS's response from *yo puedo* to *no sé si ...* in the same utterance.

4.3 Repair as Regulation

The CA notion of repair equates to what Vygotsky calls regulation (see Sec. 2.4 for elaboration on this concept). Regulation involves movement through three phases: object-regulation, other-regulation and self-regulation, the optimal state being that of self-regulation. Although control of oneself, as well as control of the task at hand, is the ultimate goal, self-regulation is an idealized concept, and achievement of self-regulated status in no way denotes the end of the developmental process. Rather, attainment of this ultimate stage signifies a speaker's ability to overcome limits in her/his language facility and self-regulate once again.

Regardless of who performs it, regulation is an FTA. Self-regulation affects the speaker's face (either positive or negative); other-regulation, which is directed towards the hearer, can also be either positive or negative and, when negative, can be even more threatening than self-regulation. When other-regulation affects the speaker's negative face, it can also be highly threatening. However, the manner in which the regulation is performed and the nature of the relationship between the parties involved are directly proportional to the level of threat posed to a party's face. The ensuing sections will present examples that highlight each of these regulatory functions.

4.3.1 Object-regulation

One of the basic functions of language is to regulate, first (non-human) objects in the environment, which is referential communication (cf. Yule 1997), then other people (either other-regulated -- controlled by others -- or other-regulating -- controlling others), and then the self -- how the individual exhibits control over her/himself and her/his own mind (metalinguistic) (Frawley 1997).[3] Object-regulation is where learners necessarily begin, their novice status obliging them to be controlled not only by objects in their immediate environment, but also by forms of the TL. All of the learners involved in this investigation had moved past this stage (although some only barely so), since they were beyond the stage of simply

naming things.' Such speakers were becoming involved in attempting to putt their language knowledge to use by engaging in spoken interaction.

4.3.2 Other-regulation

In fact, the mere presence of an interlocutor relocates a NNS in the domain of other-regulation, however slightly. This movement *only* occurs as learners begin to take the risk to use the L2 to verbalize their thoughts. In classrooms where language is only studied about and seldom used, this advancement fails to occur. But in situations where learners are encouraged to use the L2 (e.g. engage in information gaps tasks, take part in role plays, or participate in any interaction with NSs), the movement to other-regulation transpires naturally, albeit not without obstacles. Other-regulation can occur in a variety of manners including side sequences, corrections, responses to requests (direct or indirect) for assistance or collaborative completions; all of these necessarily involve other speakers.

4.3.2.1 Side Sequences

Other-regulation can take the form of side sequence (Jefferson 1972). Side sequences are deviations from ongoing discourse which may temporarily turn an interaction in another direction. In L1 encounters, side sequences are typically asides that are not directly related to the main topic of conversation. In CLEs, however, they are often

metalinguistic in nature and are triggered by a learner's linguistic limitations. In fact, they are often necessay when communication is blocked, and speakers resort to them to keep the conversation going (Day et al. 1984; cf. Merritt 1976). In other cases, they simply provide a time-out from ongoing discourse.

Side sequences may occur when a NNS is unable to foumulate a response. In the example below, the NNS takes a time out after hearing the NS's first utterance and asks him to slow his speech:

Example 4/from DS #3A:

1NS: *Oye, ¿tienes cita libre para mañana,*
Hey, do you have a free slot for tomorrow,

algún tiempo que puedo cortarme el pelo?
some time that I can cut my hair?

2NNS: Okay. Wait, slow down.

3NS: *Quiero cortarme el pelo,*
I want to cut my hair

y tiene que ser hoy,
and it has to be today,

porque mañana me voy de la ciudad.
because tomorrow I'm leaving the city.

So far so good?

4NNS: No, no. Okay.

5NS: I wanna, I wanna cut my hair.

6NNS: Oh, okay. Um, well,

In this example, the NNS seems unable to understand a single word that the NS is saying, complaining in English about the fast pace of his speech. Yet even after she asks

him to slow down, he persists with the rapid tempo, then checks with the NNS in 4 to see if she has understood his utterance in 3. Her replies of "No, no" indicate frustration on her part, so the NS finally presents the question English in 5 because: 1) the NNS apparently cannot understand and 2) she does not demonstrate the ability to speak the TL. His strategy is not to diminish his rate of speech, but rather to switch to her L1.

Side sequences can ensue from disillusionment of NNSs. Below, the NNS takes a time out from her utterance to comment on her L2 ability:

Example 6/from DS #3A:

28NNS: A las once, um, well, that's, I'm so bad at this. At 11:00, um, well, that's, I'm so bad at this.

29NS: Uh-uh.

Here, the NNS evaluates her own ability. In a most unaccommodating fashion, the NS concurs with her negative assessment of the situation! Although her diminshed linguistic capacity keep her bound to the NS, he certainly does not have to agree. This is an extremely face-threatening move on his part and demonstrates precisely what Rampton (1990b) meant when he spoke of NSs reinforcing the power difference between themselves and their NNS counterpart.

Side sequences may also occur pragmatically as NSs offer words to NNSs in anticipation of production difficulties. These offers can assume a variety of

postures, each with different amounts of threats to the face of the recipient. The cooperative NS in the following examples uses a very interesting means of accommodation:

Example 7/from DS #1A:

1NS: *Buenas tardes.*
Good afternoon.

2NNS: *Buenas tardes.* Uh,
Good afternoon. Uh,

((door opens and closes))

@@@@@@

3NS: ((whispered)) *¿En qué puedo servirle?*
How can I help you?

4NNS: Um, *¿qué asisto?* Uhhh,
Um, what I attend? Uhhh,

When the NS anticipates difficulty (cued by NNS laughter), he offers assistance in 3 (an FTA to the negative face of the NNS) in the form of suggesting in a stage whisper an appropriate formulaic phrase for the NNS's role, evidence of his accommodating spirit, despite the fact that it represents an FTA to the negative face of the NNS. The NNS accepts the suggestion, but attempts to convert the NS's offering into his own words. In doing so, he employs a false cognate (*asistir* means 'attend,' not 'assist'), then falters once again.

4.3.2.2 Other-regulation as Error Correction

'Error' refers to the use of a linguistic item in a way, which, according to fluent users of the language, indicates faulty or incomplete learning (Day *et al.*

1984:20). In Vygotskyan terms, however, errors are seen as a natural part of the learning process, a process which can be facilitated through interaction with other, more competent users of the language. Errors occur at various linguistic levels: grammatical, e.g., lexical, phonological or syntactic, and pragmatic, e.g. misuse or misinterpretation of a speech act (Searle 1969), violation of speech maxims (Grice 1975). Non-target forms may be noticed by NSs or NNSs or both, and may be regulated by either party.

In CLEs, however, NSs will necessarily other-regulate more often -- they are, after all, the more proficient users of the language. Adjustments made by others are a form of other-regulation, and they occur in two different forms: on-record and off-record (refer to Sec. 2.7).[5] Day et al. differentiate between the two based on the tone of voice used and whether or not they comprise the main thrust of the turn.

4.3.2.2.1 On-record Regulation

On-record regulation is the most threatening to the hearer. In the following example, once the NS understands what the NNS intends to say, he makes an on-record adjustment to the NNS's utterance:

Example 8/from DS #3A:

14NNS: *Uh, no: um you, um, vaya, ¿vaya?*
Uh, no: um, you, um, go, go?

15NS: *¿Vaya?*
Go?

16NNS: *Vaya, vaya a las,* um,
Go, go at, um

17NS: *No, venga.*
No, come.

18NNS: *¿Venga?*
Come?

19NS: It means come.

In 14, the NNS is actually trying to use some of the TL to tell the NS when to come for the appointment. Because she cannot remember the motion verb for come, *venir*, she begins her turn with *vaya*, a conjugated form of another motion verb *ir*, 'to go,' (the conjugated form of which also begins with the letter v). What she actually is wanting to say is come, not go. The NSS's repetition of her lexical choice in 15, also uttered with rising intonation, indicates that he does not understand what she is trying to say. However, as the syntactic structure of the target utterance develops in 16 with the addition of the prepositional phrase *a las*, the NS is able to comprehend, and he supplies the requisite item in 17, a different motion verb, *venir*. He does so with a declarative intonation, indicating that this is indeed the word she needs. She does not understand the L2 term and the NS resorts to her L1 to explain it, again with declarative intonation that indicates much frustration with

her low proficiecy. The example above shows other-regulation of the NNS by the NS, and the NS's explanation in 19 is an example of side sequence.

Although other-regulation in CLEs may result from hindrances presented by NNSs, the resulting behavior displayed by NSs may frustrate NNSs as well. Overaccommodation, as was displayed above, can be patronizing and demotivating and may actually reinforce the power difference (Rampton 1990) by indicating on a pragmatic level the dis-ability of the NNS. Several scenarios of overaccommodation are identifiable including when 1) the NS acts as if the NNS is linguistically handicapped which may be perceived as "talking down," 2) the NS controls the interaction and makes the NNS feel ignorant and dependent and 3) NNSs are labelled as 'foreigners' or 'language learners' and are made to feel inferior (Zuengler 1991:239ff). Note that all of these behaviors can be construed as manipulative strategies of power by NSs, whether conscious or not (de Certeau 1984). Not only can the use of non-accommodative strategies (whether over- or under-accommodative) undermine communication, but their use can "actually impede language learners' proficiency in a second language" (Giles, Coupland and Coupland 1991:3).

Although the NNS in the above example is indeed linguistically handicapped and is also extremely reliant on

the NS for assistance, she is nontheless able to employ a variety of tactics to keep the interaction moving forward. She procures missing lexical items and convinces the NS to carry the load of the conversation. However, the NS's overall manner is non-accommodating, in that he does not attempt to engage in negotiation on occasions where it would help the NNS, and his tone throughout the course of the interaction is rather demeaning.

The NNS in the next example is much more proficient than the one in the above interchange. The NS's regulation is even more forthright in that it contains an imperative and words supplied by the NS for the NNS who has struggled through 30+ turns trying to understand what the NS wants him to do:

Example 9/from DS 4A:

42NS: *Eh, por la mañana, ¿no tengo que llamar, de nuevo,*
Eh, in the morning, I don't have to call again

para confirmar mi-, mi cita?
to confirm my, my appointment?

¿No es necesario?
It's not necessary?

43NNS: Damn.

44NS: No, no.

45NNS: Okay.

46NS: *Tú dime, dime,*
You tell me, tell me,

"No, ya está comfirmada su cita para mañana."
"No, your appointment for tomorrow is already confirmed."

48NNS: *¿Yo teléfone mañana?* ... (3.0)
I call tomorrow?

¿Por qué?
Why?

The misunderstanding begins many utterances earlier when the NS asks about giving her name for the appointment, a question appropriate to the 'hair appointment schema.' A number of turns later she asks whether she needs to call the next day to confirm the appointment, another feature of schema within which they are operating. The NNS's lack of comprehension frustrates her to the point that she orders him to say the words she provides in 46 (another example of a side sequence), which he never says since he doesn't understand what she is talking about. They continue back and forth for 20 more exchanges when the NS gives up and terminates the interaction, exemplifying one of Goffman's (1967) several variations of the avoidance process (refer to Sec. 2.6.2). This is also an example of the NS's insisting on controlling the interaction, using her strategies and not ever allowing the NNS to employ any tactic whatsoever. By exercising this powerful strategy, the NS keeps the NNS befuddled for the duration of this particular line of questioning.

On-record regulations can be mitigated by offering an option or by using a softer tone of voice (or both). In the example below, the NS moderates the force of her on-record adjustment:

Example 10/from DS #1A:

29NNS: *Um, uh, una hora libre uh, por doce a once?*
Um, uh, one hour free, uh, for 12 to 11?

30NS: *¿Doce a, a once o doce a una?*
12 to, to 11 or 12 to 1?

31NNS: *Doce a una.*
12 to 1.

In 29, the NNS reverses the clock hours. In 30, the NS uses an either/or to question to prompt a clarification. In the side-sequence that follows, the NS questions and regulates her in 21, a form of other-regulation. Despite the fact that the question itself represents an FTA to the NS's negative face in that he chooses to respond to the error, he leaves the choice for the NNS to make. By using this approach, the NS accommodates to the NNS, thus offering him a much less face-threatening way of making an adjusment than having to respond to an outright regulation, which illustrates Goffman's notion of the corrective process -- correcting via offer (refer to Sec. 2.7). That the NNS accepts the adjustment in 22 shows her willingness to be regulated by her interlocutor.

4.3.2.2.2 Off-record Regulations

NSs can reduce the level of threat posed to the NNS's face by making off-record adjustments. In these less-intimidating types of regulations, NSs can incorporate needed adjusments into their own turns. In the example below, the NS prefaces the clock hour with the appropriate

prepositional phrase, while never calling attention to the fact that the NNS has formulated a non-target utterance:

Example 10/from DS #6B:

13NNS: *¿Pero no dos y media?*
But not 2:30?

14NS: *No, no a las dos y media,*
No, not at 2:30,

porque a las dos y media,
because at 2:30

tengo una reunión con mi jefe.
I have a meeting with my boss.

In 13, the NNS omits both preposition and article. In 14, the NS uses both in his response and repeats it again in the next part of his turn. Her attempts at other-regulation appear to be failing, as subsequent speech reveals that the NNS is unaware of the NS's efforts to regulate his utterance, and he continues to use the same non-target construction.

A similar operation appears below; however, some evidence of emerging syntax appears in the NNS's second attempt at the time construction:

Example 11/from DS #6B:

38NS: *Ah, ok, entonces, um, ¿qué tal de tres a cuatro?*
Ah, ok, then, um, what about from 3 to 4?

39NNS: *¿Tres y cuatro?*
3 and 4?

40NS: *Sí.*
Yes.

41NNS: Sí. Well, I have one *appointament tres,*
Yes. Well, I have one appointament three,

42NS: *a las tres.*
at 3:00.

43NNS: *nada a tres y media,*
nothing at 3:30,

pero tengo un appointamento cuatro,
but I have an appointment 4,

In 39, the NNS repeats a portion of the NS's prior utterance. In 41, he omits article and preposition meaning 'at.' The NS's utterance in 42 comprises an appropriate expression of time in Spanish. Obviously, the NNS does not pick up on all the adjustments provided by the NS, since the first part of his construction in 43 does include the preposition *a*, modelled by the NS in 42, but omits the determiner in the second part.[6]

NNSs may accept other-regulation by NSs but may not demonstrate the capability of producing the target form. In the example below, the NS other-regulates by conjugating the infinitive form of the verb for the NNS:

Example 12/from DS #2A:

21NNS: *Yo almorzea a las once. @@@@*
I eat at 11. @@@@

22NS: *¿Tú almuerzas a las once?*
You eat at 11?

¿A las once almuerzas?
At 11:00 you eat?

23NNS: *Sí.*
Yes.

The NS demonstrates understanding of the NNS's non-target form of the verb by incorporating an appropriately conjugated form in her own utterance. Although this

regulation is an FTA to the NNS's positive face, the NS did it in a very non-threatening manner, and the NNS was able to acknowledge the adjustment. She also offered a second utterance, rearranging the information and putting the time phrase at the beginning. In 23, the NNS appears to indicate acceptance, although it is impossible to determine whether the response is a positive answer to the question or if it repesents acceptance of the adjustment. Additionally, her affirmative answer does not demonstrate her ability to use the form that was modelled for her by the NS.

As discussed previously, single utterances can be multi-functional. Below, the NS's utterance serves a two-fold purpose: to present the target form and to request clarification:

Example 13/from DS #6B:

11NNS: *¿Uh, uno?*
Uh, one?

12NS: *¿a la una?*
At 1:00?

.
.
.

sí tengo a la una.
yes, I have at 1:00.

The NNS, omitting preposition and article, is able to make himself understood in 11. In 12 the NS requests confirmation, and later makes a statement, both of which include the missing preposition and article, a subtle attempt at other-regulation.

Regulation can involve repetition, then result in the suggestion of more appropriate phrasing. In the next example, the NS repeats my exact words, and subsequently offers more appropriate ones:

Example 14/from DS #9C:

99NNS: *Uh, favor de:de pararse allá y cuidarme,* @@@@@@@.
Uh, please stop there and take care of me, @@@@@@@.

.
.

102NSM: [@@@@@@@@@@. *¿Favor de pararse allá y cuidarme?*
[@@@@@@@@. Please stop there and take care of me?

@@@@@@ *Vigílame desde allí.*
@@@@@@ Watch me from there.

I used the phrase that appears in 102 as an interrogative in my previous turn. NSM repeats it, surrounded by laughter, and rephrases it in a more locally appropriate manner in the second part of her turn.

Learners gravitate further towards the phase of self-regulation as they become increasing aware of adjustments made by their more capable interlocutor(s). The example below highlights Corder's (1967) notion of intake, which is input that is understood and internalized by learners, as they are able to incorporate the adjusted form in their own speech.

Example 15/from DS #2A:

35NNS: *Sí, señorita, por <u>muchos</u> dinero,* @@@@
Yes Ma'am, for lots of money, @@@@

36NS: *¿Mucho?*
A lot?

37NNS: *Sí, por mucho dinero yo esperó para Ud.*
Yes, for lots of money I wait (3rd PAST) for you.

In this example, the NS disguises her regulation of the NNS, accommodating her by not accentuating their obvious difference in linguistic ability. In 35, NNS uses the plural adjective *muchos* to modify the singular noun *dinero*. NS gently regulates her (an FTA to the positive face of the NNS) by using the singular form in 36.[7] Her utterance is a double FTA -- to her own negative face as she regulates the NNS and to the negative face of the NNS as she offers the target form. The NNS notices the use of the target form and incorporates it in her next utterance in 37. Acceptance of regulation is also an FTA, but to the NS's negative face, and therefore not a risk for the NNS.

Additional analysis of the multifunctionality of the NS's response of *mucho* is that this is a very natural question that might be posed in a NS/NS conversation. It is quite plausible that the NS's response was not only an adjustment, but also a question as to how much *mucho* would actually be. A single word response, then, can function both as an answer and regulation, as well as continue the interaction. This is a good example of cooperation on the part of the NS - her restatement of the adjective in its target form could have been interpreted by the NNS either as as the natural response to "a lot?" or as an outright regulation of the NNS's previous statement; the utterance as it stands is ambiguous, illustrating an aspect of

Goffman's (1967) avoidance process (refer to Sec. 2.7). The NNS acknowledges and accepts the target form when she uses it herself in 37.[8]

Regulation can also occur at the level of pronunciation. In the next example, the NS models the appropriate pronunciation in 35:

Example 16/from DS #7B:

28NNS: *Me, me daré un telefóno de mi hermana.*
I will give me, me the phone number of my sister

.
.
.

35NS: *... ¿Cuál es su teléfono?*
... What is her phone number?

36NNS: *Teléfono es siete seis tres, tres tres once,*
Phone number is 763-3311,

In 28, the NNS speaks the word for 'telephone' with an Americanized pronunciation. Several turns later, the NS pronounces it appropriately. Even though the NS's adjustment iss not immediate, the NNS observes the difference and revises her own in 36.[9] She does not, however, pick up on the NS's inclusion of a possessive adjective in his turn in 35.

4.3.2.3 Joint Productions: Other-regulation as Response to a Request for Assistance

Ferrara (1992) discusses accommodation at the discourse level, which is illustrated by collaborative completions, or joint productions (cf. Ferrara 1991). Joint productions are "significant because they challenge our notion of how discourse is produced and interpreted"

(p. 207); their presence indicates sentences themselves are works in progress. These ideas fit well within a framework of interactional grammar and are especially applicable in CLEs where NSs can often assist their NNS interlocutors who have limited production capabilities.

Joint productions may occur as helpful utterance completions, defined as minimal additions suggested by a hearer who observes some measure of difficulty on the part of a speaker. In the example below, the NS offers a missing lexical item to the NNS who is obviously struggling:

Example 17/from DS #8B:

27NNS: *Ok, oh. ¿cuándo uh, libres, cuándo, @@@@@@,* wait,
Ok, oh, when, uh, free (pl.), when, @@@@@@,

wait, wait, *cuándo uh tienes ... (4.0) libre,*
wait, wait, wait, when uh do you have ... free

28NS: *tiempo*
time

29NNS: *tiempe*

30NS: *tiempo*
time

31NNS: *tiempo libre*
free time

In 27, the NNS is struggling for the appropriate word -- the NS offers lexical assistance in 28, a form of other-regulation. The NNS's emerging syntax in 27 (*¿cuándo uh, libres... to cuándo uh tienes libre...*) give the NS enough information to be able to offer lexical assistance in 28. Her attempted repetition in 29 and the subsequent turns show her acceptance of the offered item. The NNS attempts

to repeat the helpful completion offered by the NS, and the NS re-pronounces the word for her in 30, producing yet another instance of other-regulation. By 31, then, the NNS is able to put together an appropriate noun phrase, providing additional evidence of her emerging syntax.

Interlocutors collaboratively construct utterances without prior intention. In the example below, the joint syntax of NS and NNS emerges over the course of several turns:

Example 17/ from DS #7B:

22NNS: *NO. La salón, ah, la salón es, uh,*
No. The salon, ah, the salon is, uh,

¿cómo se dice "closed"?
How do you say closed?

23NS: *Está cerra(d)o.*
It is closed.

24NNS: *¿Está cerra(d)o?*
It is closed?

25NS: Yes.

26NNS: *a las cinco.*
at 5:00.

27NS: Um-hm.

The NS's offering in 24 seems to count for the NNS as part of her target sentence, which she continues in 26. Their joint effort results in the completion of her thought in 26, which began back in 22. Although the utterances in 22 and 24 are indeed part of a side sequence (refer to Sec. 4.3.2.1), this particular interchange can also be

classified as a joint production (refer to Sec. 3.5.3). Note the NNS's convergence to the Caribbean pronunciation of the NS.[10]

Stretches of discourse built by NSs and NNSs highlight the coordinated and cooperative efforts of interlocutors involved in joint productions. In the next example, the NS obviously fully intends to complete the NNS's thought for him:

Example 18/from DS #6B:

23NNS: *porque yo tengo un appointamento,*
because I have an apppointment

a las tres pero,
at 3 but,

24NS: *Lo puedes mover.*
You can move it.

25NNS: *Sí.*
Yes.

26NS: *Cambiar.*
Change.

In 24, the NS offers a clause that adequately completes the NNS's thought. In 26, he offers yet another lexical item, perhaps as further explanation. This is a nice example of a predictable utterance completion on the part of the NS, as he "successfully anticipates the remainder" of the NNS's proposition (Ferrara 1992:219). The manner in which he does so is not at all intrusive, and the NS accepts his completion in 25.

At times, interlocutors searching for proper terminology resort to the use of approximations, either L1-

or L2-based. This strategy may involve the use of a synonym, a word from the same lexical domain or a word that is phonologically similar to the unknown item. These approximations can be analyzed in two ways, either as indirect requests for assistance (other-regulation) or as attempts by NNSs to maintain control of themselves and the task (self-regulation).

In the example above, the NNS used a lexical approximation. Below, the NNS uses a phonological approximation to obtain assistance from her interlocutor. Her tactic definitely keeps the interaction moving forward:

Example 19/from DS #2A:

41NNS: *Uh, por veinte dólares ¿propio?*
For $20 own?

42NS: *¿Propina, veinte dólares propina?*
Tip, twenty dollars tip?

43NNS: *Sí, propina.*
Yes tip.

In 41, the NNS is unsure of the word for 'tip' and uses a phonologically similar item *propio* with rising intonation, indicating her uncertainty. In 42, the NS understands what she intends and offers the appropriate word, *propina*. The very use of the word *propio* (its phonological similarity to the missing word, the rising intonation with which it is uttered and the context within which they are operating) alerts the NS to the probability that the NNS is searching for another word, because the term makes little sense. Her use of the phonologically similar item gives her access to

the help she needed without having to ask for it directly, lessening the force of the FTA. This accomodating NS is inspired to supply the missing lexical item in 42, even though the regulation represents an FTA to the NNS's negative face. The NNS's repetition in 43 indicating her relieved acceptance of the item is an FTA to her own negative face.

Requests for other-regulation can be more forthright, yet still indirect. In the next example, the NNS invites a different kind of assistance from the NS, indicating less skill or a lower comfort level in Spanish:

Example 20/from DS #6B:

45NNS: *Tengo* 'free time,' I don't know how to say it
I have free time.

46NS: *Tiempo libre.*
Free time.

Here, the NNS incorporates an L1 borrowing into his discourse without missing a beat, then again resorts to his L1 to offer an excuse, which is an FTA to the NNS's own negative face). The excuse is correctly interpreted by the NS as a request for information, also an FTA, but this time to the NS's negative face (although mitigated by its indirectness). The NS's accommodating spirit is revealed as he supplies the missing item in 46.

Invited utterance completions may also be accompanied by excuses. In the next example, the NNS formulates an indirect request for assistance, although in this instance,

she begins to ask about an unknown item. This example is similar to the one above, except the NNS takes the lexical item offered by the NS and attempts to use it in a sentence:

Example 21/from DS #8B:

36NS: *Cinco de la tarde.*
5:00 in the afternoon.

37NNS: OK, uh, as a I don't know how to say un appoint-

38NS: *Cita.*
Appointment.

39NNS: *¿Cita?*
Appointment?

Hace, wait, uh, una cita a cinca @@@@@.
Make, wait, uh, an appointment at 5 @@@@@,

¿Si? Vale.
Yes, OK.

In 37, the NNS makes an incomplete declarative statement which the NS accurately interprets as a request for information. The confession, an FTA to her own positive face, is voiced in her L1. In fact, the only L2 lexical item in the entire utterance is the article *un*. But, because the two speakers share English as a code and due to the 'hair appointment' schema (refer to Sec. 1.1), the NS is able to anticipate the needed lexical item before the end of the NNS's turn and supply it for her in 38. Interestingly enough, the NS does not adjust the gender of the article the NNS proffered, but rather offers simply the base noun *cita*. Requests are inherently face-threatening (refer to Sec. 2.6.2), yet in this particular instance, the

NNS obviously feels comfortable in asking her interlocutor for help, perhaps due to the joint nature of their task and the shared knowledge that the NS is the expert speaker. She receives it, demonstrating that both other-regulation and collaborative completion allow the interaction to continue.

NNSs who are attempting to maintain their self-regulated status may resort to interesting means. In the example below, the NNS offers her own highly creative version of the missing item prior to verbalizing her request for assistance:

Example 22/from DS #7B:

28NNS: *y ella es una pelostilisto.*
and she is a hairstylist.

¿Cómo se dice "hairstylist"?
How do you say 'hairstylist'?

29NS: *Peluquera.*
Hairstylist.

In 28, the NNS engages in a type of L2 word coinage (an attempt to self-regulate), which is a blending of 1) the Spanish word for hair, *pelo*; 2) an L1 lexical item and 3) a piece of Spanish morphology, -o (see example 18 above for a similar operation). Realizing that this word is not the target form, she then poses her direct question in the L2, and the NS supplies the missing term in his subsequent turn, a form of other-regulation.

Following Goffman's (1967) model for counteracting FTAs (refer to Sec. 2.6.2), NSs may, using the avoidance process, choose to ignore errors made by NSs when they do not impede understanding. In the example below, the NS overlooks the missing lexical item in 18 and formulates his response to the NNS's utterance:

Example 23/from DS #7B:

18NNS: Uh, um, *la salón es fini a las cinco.*
Uh, um, the salon is fini at 5.

19NS: *Es bueno.* Ok.
That's good. Ok.

Entonces, a las cinco voy a estar aquí.
Then at 5 I'm gonna be here.

20NNS: @@@@@.

21NS: *¿Está bien?*
Is that OK?

22NNS: *NO. La salón, ah, la salón es, uh,*
NO. The salon ah, the salon is, uh,

¿cómo se dice "closed"?
how do you say "closed"?

23NS: *Está cerra(d)o.*
It is closed.

In 18, the NNS choses an approximation (*fini*) to express what her limited lexicon does not allow. Her effort to verbalize her thoughts in the L2 coupled with her choice to formulate her request for assistance in the L2 in 18 are evidence of her attempt to converge with her interlocutor. After it becomes evident in 21 that the NS does not understand *fini* in the way she had intended, the NS makes another attempt. In 22, she repeats much of her prior

statement and follows it with an L2 request for assistance in 22, reverting to her L1 only for the missing lexical item. Asking for and receiving help from the NS illustrate other-regulation. Note that, when the NS provides the requested participle, he also adjusts the verb form (from *ser* to *estar*).

This section has presented several examples which illustrate the Vygotskyan concept of other-regulation. The following segment illustrates the more advanced stage of attainment, which is self-regulation.

4.3.3 Self-regulation

L2 learners who reach the stage of self-regulation are more independent, i.e., they need only minimal assistance from their interlocutor to complete the task in which they are engaged. As discussed previously, learners can always rely on the principle of continuous access (refer to Sec. 2.4) when they encounter communicative difficulties. Thus, they can move back and forth among the levels of regulation as needed.

4.3.3.1 Self-regulation by NNS

At times, learners resort to their L1, a process known as language switch (Tarone 1978). Although traditionally seen as an abandonment of the L2, from a Vygotskyan viewpoint, the shift from L2 to L1 is "a normal psychological process that facilitates L2 production and allows the learners both to initiate and to sustain verbal

interaction" (Brooks & Donato 1994:268). Thus, in Vygotskyan terms, default to the L1 can be seen as a learner's attempt at self-regulation.

In the example below, the NNS begins her utterance in Spanish, reverts to her L1, but self-regulates immediately, thus keeping the interaction moving forward:

Example 24/from DS #3A:

33NNS: *A las doce, I have, yo tengo doce y nueve.*
At 12:00, I have, I have 12 and 9.

Even this NNS of extremely limited proficiency (refer to Example 4) demonstrates here the ability to self-regulate. She injects a phrase from her L1 which she quickly adjusts to the L2. This rapid change supports the notion that speakers can span the spectrum of regulation within the same interaction.

Learners may self-regulate in the L2 as well. In the example below, the NNS does not resort to her L1 in the regulatory process:

Example 25/from DS #4A:

27NNS: *¿Es posible yo corto tu pelo,*
Is it possible I cut your hait

eh, tres y treinto, treinta?
eh, 3:30 (MASC), :30 (FEM)?

28NS: *Treinta.*
Thirty

Here, the NNS is able to adjust his original offering to an appropriate TL form, demonstrating the ability to self-regulate. Note the confirmation of the regulation by the NS in 28.

Self-regulation can also occur after the completion of an utterance. Below, the NNS notices that an adjustment needs to be made after the fact:

Example 26/from DS #8B:

15NNS: *Tambien soy libre desde a uno.*
I'm also free from to one.

Desde, desde la una.
Until one.

The NNS adjusts in a self-regulated fashion from *a uno* to *la una*, repairing both article and gender to their target forms.

Learners are also aware of social factors (de Certeau 1984; cf. Brown and Gilman 1960; Blas-Arroyo 1994) bound up in grammar. Sensitivity to FTAs has been shown to operate both overtly and covertly. In the example below, the NNS reacts overtly to a social aspect of Spanish grammar.

Example 27/from DS #8B:

23NNS: *Su libre, wait, tú libre...*
You (formal) free, wait, you (informal) free...

This self-regulation, although not to the TL form, at least demonstrates the NNS's awareness of the formal/informal 'you' that exists in Spanish, but not in English. Since the NS and NNS are approximately the same age, the NNS self-regulates to the more socially appropriate *tú* form

More advanced NNSs may make needed adjustments without ever disrupting the rhythm of their utterance. In the example below, the NNS easily self-regulates:

Example 28/from DS #9C:

9NNS: *He montado a caballo varios, varias veces.*
I have ridden horses several times.

Here, I am able to self-regulate by modifying the gender of the adjective to agree with the feminine noun.

In addition, more advanced NNSs can switch between L1 and L2 with relative ease. In the example below, I switch to English to name a particular telephone process:

Example 29/from DS #9C:

166NNS: *Hay que conseguir "call waiting" entonces.*
You need to get call waiting then.

168NNS: "Call waiting," @@@@@@@@@
.
.
.
170NNS: *Parece como dos lineas=*
It's like 2 lines=
.
.
.
172NNS: *=con un número=*
=with one number=

In 166 I resort to my L1 for the requisite lexical item. Yet the matrix of the sentence was uttered in the TL, and this type of sentence is characteristic of the speech of competent bilingual NSs engaged in the process known as code-switching, which occurs with great frequency in bilingual communities (Grosjean 1982; cf. Wardhaugh 1992). In this case, default to English actually helped to propel

the interaction forward. Although I lacked an L2 term for the technological process known as 'call waiting,[11] I am, over the course of two subsequent turns, able to explain myself via circumlocution and demonstrate my self-regulated status.

The examples above have highlighted self-regulation by NNS of varying degrees of proficiency. Self-regulation, of course, occurs frequently in the speech of NSs, and is not limited to those involved in CLEs.

4.3.3.2 Self-regulation by NS:

There are a myriad of reasons for self-regulation, both grammatical and pragmatic. In the example below, the NS follows the lead of the NNS before realizing that the NNS's lexical choice was not the appropriate one:

Example 30/from DS #5B:

3NNS: *Um, ¿qué tiempo es bueno para tú?*
Um, what time is good for you?

4NS: *El tiempo, tengo, mis horas libres son ...*
The time, I have, my free times are ...

Here, the NS begins his utterance with the same general word for 'time' that the NNS used, and then self-regulates to the appropriate specific expression for 'time.'

The thought to word process described by Vygotsky is often very apparent in the speech of NSs. In the example below, the evolution of the NS's utterance reflects her thought process:

Example 31/from DS #9C:

1NSM: *Voy a poner éste, esta hoja.*
I'm going to put this, this leaf.

In the above, NSM alters the demonstrative pronoun to the demonstrative adjective, to be more specific.

4.3.4 Summary of Stages of Regulation

The excerpts discussed above provide clear examples of the various stages of regulation proposed by Vygotskyan theory. While the categories are useful in the analysis of data from a theoretical standpoint, they can become somewhat ambiguous during the application process. This is because speaker intentions are not always clear. While the ambiguities of classification and interaction make particular examples difficult to analyze, the Vygotskyan framework is nonetheless very useful from a pedagogical standpoint. Examples provided clearly illustrate that, although beginning speakers may well experience difficulty when interacting with NSs, they are certainly aided in the process (in most cases) and can realize some measure of success in the completion of a task or other interaction. Certainly, the Vygotskyan concepts of regulation, ZPD and PCA easily lend themselves to the developing grammatical proficiency of any L2 speaker. In one particular instance, a novice speaker was shown to span the spectrum of regulation within the same interaction. Results of this investigation lend support to Donato and Lantolf's (1990)

argument for observation of learners modification of tasks to attain a goal rather than for examination of their output.

4.4 Pragmatic Repair in CLEs

The examples discussed in the previous sections show how repair can be used to modify utterances for grammatical reasons. However, just as grammar is insufficient to account for all occurrences in language, so repair occurs for other than grammatical reasons in conversation. The definition of repair offered earlier, as a means by which "errors, unintended forms or misunderstandings are corrected by speakers or others during conversation" (Richards et al. 1992:314) needs to be expanded. This is supported by Schegloff, Jefferson and Sack's (1977) distinction between correction and repair which says the former involves the replacement of a 'mistake' or 'error' by what is 'correct,' (a grammatical function), while the latter is neither dependent upon error, nor confined to replacement, i.e., could be pragmatic.

Pragmatically, repair can occur when preferred response is not forthcoming or if the speaker anticipates interactional difficulty. Consider the following example:

Example 27/from DS #1A:

12NS: *¿A qué hora se empieza a cortar el pelo Ud.?*
What time do you start cutting hair?

13NNS: Um, *¿doce y media um, a uno?* Uh, [@@@
Um, 12:30 um, to one?

14NS: [*No, pero,*
No, but,

¿A qué horas abren: en la mañana?
What time do ya'll open: in the morning?

¿A qué horas llegan,
What time do ya'll arrive?

15NNS: Uh, [@@@@@@@

16NS: *[en la mañana?*
[in the morning?

17NNS: *¿Hora, @@@@@@, hora por tu [cita?*
Hour, @@@@@@, hour for your [appointment?

18NS: *[Yo tengo libre,*
[I am free

de ocho a nueve de la mañana.
from 8 to 9 in the morning.

Quizás si Ud. puede cortarme el pelo,
Perhaps if you can cut my hair

a las ocho la mañana.
at 8:00 in the morning.

O ¿a qué hora abren Uds. la peluquería?
Or, what time do ya'll open the shop?

In 12 the NS begins investigating the possibility of an early-morning appointment. But the NNS's responses in 13, 15 and 17 are evidence that he does not comprehend the nature of the questions; so, for pragmatic reasons, the NS engages in continued attempts at repairing his utterance. Unable to respond appropriately, the NNS begins a series of offers in 19 and subsequent turns, a tactical move on his part that allowed the interaction to proceed.

Example 28/from DS #5B:

4NS: *Y ¿cuáles, cuáles son las horas que,*
And what, what are the times that

Ud. tiene libres para la cita?
you have free for the appointment?

5NNS: Um, @@@@@@@, I don't know what you said.

6NS: ... *¿Cuándo tú puedes cortarme el cabello?*
... When can you cut my hair?

7NNS: Uh-uh.

8NS: *¿A qué hora?*
At what time?

9NNS: *Uh, mis horas son ...*
My hours are ...

The NS uses three different interrogative words to ask when would be a good time for the appointment before he finds one in 8 that the NNS can understand.

Adverbial clauses following ending intonation are the "products of speaker-recipient negotiation specifically aimed at achieving interactional ends" (Ford 1993:102). Such clauses, known as post-completion extension (PCEs) are typically inserted at possible TRPs (refer to Sec. 1.5.1) or after hearers have demonstrated disbelief or lack of understanding. The following example illustrates a more extensive attempt at accommodation by the NS, lending credence to Ng and Bradac's (1993) stance that competent users of a language can express the same intention in a variety of ways:

Example 28/from DS #3A:

46NS: *¿Cuánto sería en total?*
How much in all?

La propina más el corto de pelo,
The tip plus the haircut.

¿cuánto sería en total?
How much in all?

47NNS: *No entiendo.*
I don't understand.

48NS: *Total. Todo.*
Total. Everything.

¿Cuánto sería por todo?
How much for everything?

Tengo que pagarle,..
I have to pay you...

In this excerpt, the NNS's lack of understanding elicits a variety of syntactic constructions from the NS, all pragmatic in nature. Her first utterance in 46 is one she considered to be sufficient, as evidenced by her completion point. However, the NS seems to sense that the NNS does not understand and offers a further explanation. When the NNS says in 47 that she still does not comprehend, the NS offers additional information in 48 and 50. By 51 the NNS has understood what the NS is trying to tell her, and they are able to come to an agreement. The NS offers the NNS much assistance in her continued rephrasals. The reduction of clauses in 46 to single words in 48 and the simplification of the more complex conditional phrase *Cuánto sería* in 46 with higher frequency constructions such as *Tengo que pagarle*, *¿Cuánto me cuesta?*, and *¿Cuánto me va*

a costar? in 48 and 50 are evidence of her accomodating spirit. Finally, in 53, the NS receives the answer she is looking for.

As discussed previously, sometimes NSs' attempts at rephrasals are not more understandable at all. In the example below, the NS's words increase in complexity and confuse the NNS even more:

Example 29/from DS #4A:

22NS: *Tengo que dar mi nombre,*
I have to leave my name?

23NNS: *¿Cómo? ¿Por favor?*
What? Please?

.
.
.

40NS: *¿No hay necesidad que yo llame antes,*
Is it necessary that I call beforehand

por teléfono para reconfirmar?
by phone to confirm?

¿No es necesario?
Isn't it necessary?

41NNS: *Está, no comprendo. No sé.*
It is, I don't understand. I don't know.

42NS: *Eh, por la mañana,*
Eh, in the morning

¿no tengo que llamar, de nuevo,
I don't have to call again

para confirmar mi-, mi cita?
to confirm my, my appointment?

¿No es necesario?
It isn't necessary?

43NNS: Damn.

44NS: No, no.

45NNS: Okay.

46NS: *Tú dime, dime,*
You tell me,

"No, ya está comfirmada su cita para mañana."
"No, your appointment for tomorrow is already confirmed."

.
.
.

48NS: *No, no, eh, si es necesario que,*
No, no, eh, if it is necessary that

yo reconfirme por la mañana mi cita.
I reconfirm my appointment in the morning.

Voy a quedar confirmada para esa hora.
I'm going to be confirmed for that time.

What starts in 22 is still going on in 40. Here, the NS asks about confirming her appointment. The NNS's lack of comprehension is evident in 41, 43, 45. Although in 42 the NS does offer *por la manana*, she never suggests a viable alternative to the verb *confirmar*, which she proceeds to use throughout the interaction. In 46 the NS tells the NNS exactly what to say, an extremely face-threatening move. Interestingly, the NS uses two different forms of address within the same clause - the informal *dime* and the more formal *su cita*. The less formal item is in command form when NS is instructing NNS in what to say; the formal possessive pronoun is in the utterance that NNS would be delivering back to her, thereby accentuating their status difference. This examples also illustrates two of the constraints delineated by Fairclough (1989) -- 1) a subject constraint, which accentuates the status difference between

NS and NNS and 2) a content constraint, when the NS tells the NNS exactly what to say. It is unlikely, however, that the linguistically imposed difference in status was made clear to the NNS in this instance. However, these strategies of disaccommodation do little to foster comprehension or promote good feelings between interlocutors.

Supplementary clauses may also appear as 'afterthoughts' (Chafe 1994), unplanned information tacked on to the end of a sentence which the speaker had originally intended to end but then thought of "something else that would also be useful for the hearer to know" (ibid., p. 6). Consider the following example:

Example 29/from DS #1A:

21NNS: *Okay. Um, ¿el hora uh, para, ... (3.0)*
OK. Um, the hour uh, for,

nueve a diez?
9:00 to 10:00?

22NS: *No puedo.*
I can't.

Tengo que trabajar.
I have to work.

¿Qué tal, qué tal a las once de la mañana?
What about, what about 11:00AM?

In 22, the NS is going to refuse the NNS's offer, an FTA. He opts to include additional information, that he has to work. As a customer, the NNS is under no obligation to justify why he cannot come at the suggested time, but decides to include it anyway, likely as an FSA after his

refusal, an FTA. He follows it with a suggestion as to an alternative time, also an FSA.

4.5 Summary

The examples in this chapter have clearly illustrated the concept of repair on CLEs and have made a strong case for the Vygotskyan continuum of regulation, showing both NSs and NNSs speakers engaged in the entire spectrum, from object-regulation through self-regulation. De Certeau's (1984) social theory was applied to the examples as well, demonstrating that tactical and strategic moves were effective in navigating the difficulties encountered by all parties involved in CLEs. Another practical tactic/ strategy that is plentiful in spoken interactions is laughter. The next chapter explores laughter in CLEs and shows how productive or how threatening it can be for CLE interlocutors.

4.6 End Notes

1. The *tener que* + infinitve construction, which means 'to have to do something' is one that appears early in most all introductory Spanish textbooks and is one that is extremely common in casual conversation in Spanish.

2. It is likely that the NNS was reaching for the interrogative *cuándo*, 'when,' but used *cuánto*, 'how much, how many' instead.

3. See Jakobson (1980) for further discussion of the metalinguistic functions of language -- conative and directive.

4. One of the NNSs did, however, experience extreme difficulty in verbalizing her thoughts; she remained regulated by TL forms and her interlocutor, who oftentimes resorted to English to assist her, throughout the course of the interaction.

5. These categories are reminiscent of Brown and Levinson's (1987:68ff) description of strategies for doing FTAs bald on-record, with and without redress.

6. In SLA research, this rollercoaster type of production ability displayed by the NNS within the confines of a single turn is called U-shaped (Kellerman 1979) learning, whereby learner appear to have mastered a form, then later produce non-target forms.

7. The NS's response in 36 is the mirror-image of the equally ambiguous NNS response in 23 of example 12.

8. This offers some support for the claim that SLA occurs in negotiated interaction.

9. Schmidt (1993) argues that linguistic forms can serve as intake for learners *only* if they are noticed.

10. See Alba (1982) for a discussion of a variety of features in Caribbean Spanish.

11. In 1991, call waiting was a telephone service only recently made available in the United States. It is doubtful whether there indeed was an L2 equivalent at that time, most especially in the Dominican Republic.

CHAPTER 5

THE MULTIPLE FUNCTIONS OF LAUGHTER IN CLEs

5.1 On Laughter in Conversation

Although laughter is a vital interactional feature, it has only been recognized as a valid area of study during recent years (Glenn 1987, 1989; Jefferson 1979, 1985, 1994; Jefferson, Sacks and Schegloff 1987; Norrick 1989, 1993, 1994; Schenkein 1972). In fact, many participants in and students of conversation still do little more than indicate and/or briefly mention that laughter has occurred (Jefferson 1985):

> Conversational laughter, commonplace and trivial as it may seem, proves enormously important in the moment-by-moment creation and ratification of a variety of interactional activities which constitute our social world (Glenn 1991:156-157).

It is not difficult to understand why this crucial trait remained unstudied for so long, since laughter not only seems disorderly but can be also extremely difficult to interpret due to its multiple functions. Furthermore, analytical approaches to determine laughter's functions -- however inexact they may be -- are only now becoming available. Previous research has focussed almost exclusively on native language interactions. This chapter examines some of the pragmatic features of laughter in CLEs

and shows how laughter can function grammatically in the negotiation of meaning. I analyze examples from my data and develop a new typological framework for laughter. My framework, which can be applied to both CLEs and native language interactions, reveals an orderly diversity of roles of laughter in spoken interaction. Central to my analysis is the notion of 'face' (Brown and Levinson 1987; Goffman 1967). My analysis clearly reveals that laughter's many faces are intimately linked with the multiple aspects context in which it occurs and that laughter can serve to diminish the force of some FTAs.

5.2 Laughter and Face

Face (Brown & Levinson 1987; Goffman 1967) is an important social factor to be considered in the analysis of CLEs and is undeniably relevant to the study of laughter. As discussed previously, face can be negative and positive (refer to Sec. 1.3 and 2.6.2, as well as to determinations of face activity in particular interactions in the previous two chapters). Negative face is the desire to be unimpeded in one's actions; positive face is the desire for approval. In conversation, both interlocutors have certain interactional goals as well as an over-riding need for approval. The resulting 'mutual vulnerability of face' (Brown and Levinson 1987:61) persuades most people to be cooperative in spoken interactions.

Face is manifested in conversation through face-threatening actions (FTAs) and face-saving actions (FSAs). FTAs are those which are potentially harmful to either the negative or positive face of either the speaker or hearer. When face-threatening situations do arise in conversation, NSs typically employ FSAs for neutralizing such occurrences.[1] These behaviors are a part of NSs' communicative repertoire which they can use to extricate themselves from face-threatening situations. CLEs necessarily complicate the face-maintenance process. Given the intrinsic difficulties involved in CLEs in general, it can be assumed that such interactions would be even more susceptible to FTAs than L1 interactions, for NSs and NNSs alike.[2] Before classifying laughter as face-threatening or not, though, it will first be necessary to explore just what laughter is, who uses it and where exactly it tends to occur.

5.3 Towards a Definition of Laughter

Laughter is one manifestation of a complex network of emotions (Gregory 1924) that can be displayed in a variety of manners. A "non-verbal expressive act...confined to non-linguistic vocal and breathing sounds and to the operation of the facial features, [laughter is] often accompanied by physical gesticulations" (Hertzler 1970:37). Its sounds grade into one another without fixed boundaries. Many folk metalinguistic terms exist for types of laughter

such as chuckles, giggles, laughs and guffaws, with a myriad of sounds in between. Each labelled kind of laugh has its own culturally unique meaning, which must be understood as being different in all features mentioned above for different cultures (Burling 1992).

The central sound feature of laughter is aspiration - [h] reiterated or combined with a limited range of other sounds. Laughter can occur with the mouth closed [m], half-open [n] or totally open [h] and can be accompanied by glottalization ['m], ['n] or ['h] (Edmonson 1987). The laughter consonants can be accompanied by a variety of vowels - from the front high vowel [i] through [e], [æ], [ə], [a], [ɔ], [o] to the high back vowel [u] (Apte 1985:251) - or by a vocalic nasal, [m] or [n]. All of these sounds are subject to varying degrees of length, pitch and stress and are congruent with the characteristics of *non-words* as described in Goffman (1984:112ff) which include 1) the lack of a canonical correct spelling and 2) heights of pitch foreign to ordinary speech.

Edmonson (1987) identified a variety of laugh patterns including 1) mild laughter - often monosyllabic and of brief duration, 2) real amusement - involving less glottalization and normally lasting more than one second and 3) intense laughter - several sequential utterances separated by gasping for breath (Edmonson 1987). These

sounds "encode a range of interpretable messages, feigned or sincere, revealing and sometimes involuntary" (Edmonson 1987:26ff).

People in all cultures smile and laugh, albeit for a variety of reasons. While there is some controversy about whether laughter is innate or learned behavior, it is undisputed that smiling and laughing transcend cultural boundaries. Laughter is a situational response, with laughter-producing situations strongly determined by cultural conventions.[3] The notion of laughter in our culture is most immediately associated with humor. Although the two concepts are often intertwined, certainly not all laughter is humorous, nor does every humorous event evoke laughter (Berlyne 1969; Chapman & Foot 1976). Laughter can be viewed as a behavior, while humor is more of a tradition, "intimately and predictably related to cultural values" (Edmonson 1952:5).

One of the paradoxes of laughter is that it is highly individual, while being culturally shared. Individual speakers have unique and often distinctive laughs. Furthermore, it is so easy for the NS to identify a 'false' or 'forced' laugh, that these two terms comprise part of metalinguistic folk laughter.

5.4 Placement of Laughter in CLEs

Not at all random in its occurrence, laughter is strategically located, and it is "tied in a most powerful

way to the immediately prior utterance" (Schenkein 1972:365). Laughter can enter a conversation in a variety of ways and for a myriad of different reasons.

5.4.1 Speaker laughter

Speaker laughter, 'the occasional brief laughs speakers intermingle with their utterances' (Cox 1982:3), has a variety of uses in conversation. Speaker laughter provides information about how the speaker intends for a particular utterance to be understood: ironically, sarcastically, facetiously, with disdain or amusement. In addition, speakers may include laughter to indicate that something funny is coming up in the conversation or to initiate shared laughter.

Cox (1982) identifies four functions of speaker laughter, three of which 'appear to violate or push against conversational norms,' and would hence be potential FTAs: 1) boasting, 2) challenging, 3) making emotionally-laden statements and 4) expressing humor. Boasts allow for bragging about one's own abilities'; challenges are somewhat less likely to occur in cohesive groups; and emotionally-laden comments are often perceived as face-threatening. Although the expression of amusement would not normally be perceived as an FTA, in CLEs, it might carry a more negative connotation.

The following example from the free conversation comprises a challenge. NSM describes a new policy soon to

be initiated by the local phone company; my laughing response and comments challenge what she says:

Example 1/from DS #9C:

152NSM: *??? Van a dar nada más cada mes*
??? They are going to give just

siete horas de conversación
7 hours of conversation each month

por lo que tú pagas ...
for what you pay ...

.
.
.

160NNS: [*¿Pero, de:larga distancia o=?*
But, of: long distance or?

161NSM: *=No, local.*
No, local.

162NNS: [*Sh@@@@it. ¿Siete horas? No@@@o.*
Shit. Seven hours? No.

163NSCl: [*Siete horas*
7 hours

164NSMon: [*al mes*
per month

I cannot believe what I have just heard - that the phone company is going to charge on a per-minute basis for local phone calls over and above seven hours per month. When confirmation comes from NSM in 161, I speak an expletive in my L1. My within-speech laughter in 162 serves a two-fold function: 1) to express disbelief and 2) to soften my use of an expletive.[5] Both challenge and mitigation are FTAs in which the speaker is negatively evaluating positive face - that of the hearer(s) as well as her own. This follows Cox's (1982) line of reasoning that more socially skilled

speakers may use laughter as a mitigator whereas the less skilled ones do not. Moreover, since my disbelief is directed at the phone company policy rather than at NSM who is merely the messenger, the force of the FTA is naturally diminished. On the contrary, it could be interpreted as a criticism of the NS's country and therefore, by metonymic inclusion, a criticism of the NS.

Laughter can always constitute an FTA, most especially when it emanates from a NS in a CLE. The next example from the free conversation shows NSM's amusement by my recounting of a story of an interaction I had with a guard at the university. The good-natured relationship between the speakers easily reduces the force of the FTA:

Example 2/from DS #9C:

105NNS: ... Y *andaba con palo [grande.*
... And I had a big stick

106NSM: *[Yo te cuido, yo te cuido,*
[I'll watch you, I'll watch you,

con un palo, @@@@@@@@
with a stick. @@@@@@@@

107NSC: [@@@@@@@

108NSMon: [@@@@@@@

109NSM: [*¡Qué sorprendido estoy!*

¿y ese palo?
and that stick?

Con un pedazo de palo, @@@@.
With a piece of stick, @@@@,

Bueno, con ese palo,
Good, with that stick

estoy llegando de noche de la universidad
I'm coming home at night from the university

que le agarró un pedazo de palo.
so she grabbed a piece of stick.

No quiero problemas.
I don't want problems.

Déjame entrar, ésto es pa' @@@@@@@@
Let me in, this is to @@@@@@@@@

110NSCl: [@@@@@@@@

111NSM: [@@@@@

112NNS: [@@@@@@@@@@@

113NSM: [*defenderme,*
[defend myself,

I am telling the group about coming home from the university after dark and picking up a stick in case I encountered something. NSM begins in 106 to express what I might have been thinking that evening as I picked up the stick. Her turn, which ends with laughter, elicits laughter from NSCl and NSMon in 107 and 108. As she continues to vebalize my probable thought pattern, she elicits more laughter from both girls and from me (110-113), before concluding her utterance in 113. Although her expression of humor could be considered an FTA, my display of amusement in this particular instance negated the force of any FTA.

5.4.2 Hearer laughter

Laughter may occur as a response to speaker laughter or may be offered voluntarily by recipients. Jefferson (1979) identifies the following responses to speaker

laughter: a) recipient laughter - constitutes acceptance of a 'laugh invitation;' b) recipient silence - may indicate misunderstanding of the utterance on the part of the hearer[6] or may generate further pursuit of laughter by the speaker; c) recipient non-laughing speech - declines the speaker's laugh invitation and allows the conversation to continue.[7]

5.4.2.1 Recipient laughter

Hearer laughter can carry either positive or negative implications, depending upon the situation and those involved. On a positive note, laughter is commonly used as a backchannelling device to reinforce or respond to the current speaker, lending support and agreement to what is being said. The example below reflects a supportive use of laughter by the NS:

Example 3/from DS #9C:

22NNS: ¡Qué vestido!=
What a dress!

23NSC: =@@@@@@@@=

24NNS: =¡qué pierni [ta!
What legs!
25NSC: [@@@@@@@@@@

26NSM: Parece muslito de pollo.
Looks like a chicken thigh.

27NSMon: Eso es feita.
That's really ugly.

28NSJM: Fea.
Ugly.

29NSM: Fea del carajo pero tiene un cuerpo,
Ugly as sin, but she has a body,

The laughter emanating from NSC in 23 and 25 is in response and agreement to what I have said in 22 and 24. The other conversational participants add words, not laughter, indicating their agreement with my assessment of the soap opera star's physical attributes and attire.

But laughter can also carry negative overtones. In the example below, NSC volunteers laughter as a response to NSM's exclamation:

Example 4/from DS #9C:

16NNS: *¿Qué es?*
What is it?

¿Otra hoja de anis?
Another leaf of anise?

17NSM: *Jalar de pus. ¡A probarla!*
To extract the pus. I dare you to touch it!

Ufff, chilá, <<¡YE [EOW!>>

18NSC: [@@@@@@@@@

19NSM: [*Anda, Claudia, ¿se han venido?*
[Hey, Claudia, have they come yet?

Ve cómo se tiende la ropa afuera.
Go fold the clothes outside.

Tal vez la de él está en la lavadora lavada ya.
Maybe his clothes in the washer are already done.

Ay, yo no me acordaba, pa' que se la lleve limpia,
Ay, I didn't remember, so that he wears clean ones

pa' que no se lleve la ropa sucia.
so that he doesn't wear dirty clothes.

***Cierre** la puerta.*
Close the door.

***Tiéndela** afuera.*
Fold them outside.

*Este, **abre** la puerta que ahí amanece seca,*
Uh, open the door so that they dry here

que yo quiero que él lleve la ropa limpia ...
because I want him to wear clean clothes ...

This excerpt comes from a conversation in the kitchen between NSM and myself. Up to this point, NSC has not been an active conversational participant. It is quite possible that her laughter alerted NSM to her presence. NSC's laughter in 18 responds to NSM's exclamation in 17 as she burned her tongue when tasting the dish she was preparing. Although not sounding malicious, this laughter may nonetheless have been construed as an FTA, since NSM's retort in 19 contains several imperatives -- also FTAs -- (indicated in bold) directed at NSC.

Hearer laughter may sometimes be rather ambiguous. In the example below, NSM volunteers laughter in response to my statement in 105:

Example 5/from DS #9C:

105NNS: Uh-huh. Y andaba con palo grande.
Uh-huh. And I had a big stick.

106NSM: *Yo te cuido, yo te cuido,*
I'll watch you, I'll watch you,

con un palo, @@@@@@@@
with a stick @@@@@@@@

107NSC: [@@@@@@@

108NSMon: [@@@@

In 97 (refer to Appendix F), I begin to tell the group about an interaction I had earlier with a guard at the university. I laugh at my own utterance in 99, and the

group joins in. In 105, I continue my story and in 106, embellishes on my story, offering words and including laughter at the end of her turn. NSC and NSMon laugh in response to the funny story I told and at NSM's enhancement.

5.4.2.2 Recipient non-laughing speech

The examples from the task-oriented speech below contain instances of recipient non-laughing speech by both NSs and NNSs. Laughter can occur in CLEs when NNSs are experiencing production difficulties. In the example below, the NNS laughs but no laughter is rendered by the NS:

Example 6/from DS #7B:

5NS: *¿Cuándo puedes cortarme el cabello?*
When can you cut my hair?

6NNS: *Uh, uh, yo soy, um, uh, @@@,*
Uh, uh, I am, um, uh, @@@,

¿sesenta minutos a las nueve a.m.?
sixty minutes at 9:00AM?

7NS: *No, a las nueve no puedo.*
No, at 9:00 I can't.

Tengo trabajo desde las nueve de la mañana,
I have work from 9:00 in the morning,

a las nueve a. m. hasta las once a. m.
at 9:00AM until 11:00AM.

Here, the NS fails to laugh because there is nothing funny. The NNS laughs because she is unable to formulate a response the first time she tries, and she uses laughter as a production strategy in the formulation of her utterance.

In 6 her stammering uh and um around her use of *yo soy* apparently indicate that she lacks the requisite lexical item. In this case, her laughter is included as an FSA, perhaps to hide her embarrassment. Intent in expressing her thought, she laughs, then opts for an alternative way of expressing herself, using *¿sesenta minutos a las nueve a.m.?*, an odd, but effective, utterance that is easily understood by the NS, as evidenced by his reply in 7.[8]

NS laughter is often difficult to interpret for NNSs involved in CLEs. In the example below, the NS laughs, but the NNS does not:

Example 7/from DS #6B:

29NNS: *Pero no, no tengo, no tengo que comer,*
But I don't, I don't have, I don't have to eat.

¿entiendes?
Do you understand?

No es importante para mí.
It's not important for me.

30NS: *Ah, no es importante para tí.*
Ah, it's not important for you.

Ah, ok. Para mí, sí, @@@@@@@@@@@@@
Ah, ok. For me it is, @@@@@@@@@@@@@

31NNS: *So, ¿qué horas está bueno para tú?*
So, what times (PL) is (SING) good (SING) for you?

In 29, the NNS who is playing the role of hairstylist, defers to the customer (NS), a customary move in service encounter situations. In 30, the NS almost exactly repeats the NNS's words, changing only the object of the preposition to reflect the change in person (mí to ti).

She changes again, in the second part of her utterance, to personalize the object for herself (back to mí), then follows it with laughter, which could be interpreted as somewhat critical, a certain FTA. Perhaps the NS included the laughter to mitigate the force of her strong comment. The NNS begins his utterance in his L1, with the use of 'so,' then puts the ball back in the NS's court.

In the next example, the NNS laughs following the production of a non-target form, which she is promptly able to adjust:

Example 8/from DS #8B:

13NNS: *Soy, uh, libre a nueve y diez @@@@@@ a diez.*
I am, uh, free at 9 and 10 @@@@@@ to 10.

14NS: *Nueve a diez.*
9 to 10.

But, pero, pero yo tengo trabajo a las nueve.
But, but, but I have work at 9:00.

In 13 the NNS says that she is free at 9:00 *and* 10:00, when she means that she is free from 9:00 *until* 10:00. Her laughter comes just after an utterance in need of adjustment and just prior to her self-regulation (see Sec. 4.3.3). The NS's response in 14 ratifies her adjustment. At no time, however, does the NS laugh.

Hearer laughter can also function in the management of conversation by serving as a topic-ending indicator. In the example below, my within-speech laughter as agreement marks a natural end to the topic being discussed:

Example 9/from DS #9C:

148NSJM: *(cantando a la mexicana...)* *Nohombre*
(in a Mexican sing-song voice...) No, man

149NSM: [*Nohombre,*
No, man

150NSJM: [*Nohombre, los mexicanos*
No, man..The Mexicans

sí hablan cantando porque dicen, "ándale..."
talk singsong-like because they say, "Andale..."

151NNS: U(@@@)uh.

ABRUPT TOPIC SHIFT...

152NSM: *??? Van a dar nada más cada mes siete horas de*
??? They're going to give only seven hours of

conversación por lo que tú pagas ...
conversation for what you pay ...

JM has been commenting on how many Mexicans speak using a sing-song type voice. My laughter, which indicates understanding and agreement, is a natural place for the discussion to end. My laughing comment constitutes a closing remark that allows the conversation to proceed in a different direction.

5.4.3 Shared laughter

Laughing is one of the few things that people do simultaneously in conversation (cf. Sacks 1992:571, Vol. II). As a "fundamentally social activity" (Glenn 1989:126), laughter usually occurs in the presence of others and is most enjoyed when others participate. In fact, not only is it acceptable to laugh together, but solo laughter is often suspect (Edmonson 1987).[9] Interactional

or shared laughter, "conversation's greatest device for conviviality and co-alignment" (Moerman 1988:73), can occur even if the current speaker does not participate.

There were a multitude of instances of shared laughter in the free conversation, while there were none in the service encounters. The example below contains an instance of shared laughter between myself and all NS participants involved in the conversation:

Example 10/from DS #9C:

65NNS: *¡Ese ladrón!* @@@@@@ [@@
That thief! @@@@@

66NSC: [@@@@@@ [@@@@

67NSJM: [@@@@@@ [@@@

68NSM: [@@@@@@@@@@...*woo-hoo*!

Participants are watching TV (a telenovela, or soap opera). I comment on the character of one of the TV stars in the soap opera and follow it with laughter. In a different setting, this instance of NNS laughter might be construed as a type of boasting by other conversational participants (a potential FTA), yet in this amicable atmosphere it was not perceived as such, as the NSs all joined in (66-68).

5.5 Functions of Laughter in CLEs

The preceding discussion has focussed on the placement of laughter. In the upcoming section, I consider who laughs and why. Examples extracted from my data highlight laughter produced by both NSs and NNSs.

5.5.1 NNS Laughter

As mentioned previously, incomplete grammatical competence is inherently face-threatening to NNSs. They can preface comments about which they are uncertain with laughter, thereby offering an apology or disguising ignorance (Giles and Oxford 1978); they may also use laughter 'as a framing device for potentially ambiguous comments' (Sacks unpublished manuscript, cited in Cox 1982:1). Laughter, then becomes sort of a buffer, a face-saving mechanism that forms part of their turn.

Laughter can help extricate NNSs from interactional difficulties (Glenn 1991:151) by prolonging the exchange and allowing for additional processing time. In the interim, NNSs may be able to interpret a previously unintelligible utterance, which is exactly what transpires in the example below:

Example 11/from DS #1A:

12NS: *¿A qué horas empieza a cortar el pelo Ud.?*
What time do you start cutting hair?

13NNS: Um, *¿doce y media um, a uno?* Uh, [@@@
Um, 12:30 um, to one?

14NS: [*No, pero,*
[No, but,

¿A qué horas abren: en la mañana?
What time do ya'll open: in the morning?

¿A qué horas llegan,
What time do ya'll arrive?

15NNS: Uh, [@@@@@@@

16NS: *[en la mañana?*
[in the morning?

17NNS: *¿Hora, @@@@@@, hora por tu [cita?*
Hour, @@@@@@, hour for your [appointment?

18NS: *[Yo tengo libre,*
[I am free

de ocho a nueve de la mañana.
from 8 to 9 in the morning.

Quizás si Ud. puede cortarme el pelo,
Perhaps if you can cut my hair

en la mañana.
in the morning.

O ¿a qué hora abren Uds. la peluquería?
Or, what time do ya'll open the shop?

19NNS: Um, @@@@@@
@, ((deep inhalation))

uh:, okay, um, *pero tú corta,*
but you cut (3RD SING)

uh:, *tu pe-, tu pelo para una hora?*
your, ha-, your hair for an hour?

20NS: *Sí.*
Yes.

The NS poses a direct question in 12 that the NNS is unable to interpret. His responses in 13, 15, 17 all contain laughter, indicating his uncertainty. After beginning his utterance in 19 with a discourse marker, further laughter and a deep breath, the NNS is finally able to formulate an utterance that elicits a positive response from the NS. That he was able to regain control of the task and at last compose a somewhat intelligible utterance indicate his persistence to sustain the interaction. As Sanders (1995)

notes, laughter offers some breathing space for NNSs to gather their thoughts while simultaneously signalling good will.

Laughter can also be used by NNSs when they lack a requisite lexical item. In the example below, the NNS employs within-speech laughter in anticipation of difficulty. The laughter and her stammerings kept the utterance in progress and as her syntax developed, the NS was able to discern the missing item and supply it for her:

Example 12/from DS #8B:

27NNS: *Ok, oh. ¿cuándo uh, libres, cuándo, @@@@@@, wait,*
Ok, oh, when, uh, free (pl.), when, @@@@@@, wait,

wait, wait, cuándo uh tienes ... (4.0) libre,
wait, wait, when uh do you have free

28NS: *tiempo*
time

29NNS: *tiempe*

30NS: *tiempo*
time

31NNS: *tiempo libre*
free time

The NNS begins her utterance in 27 with two discourse markers that indicate her initial tentativness. As her syntax evolves (from *cuándo uh, libres* to *cuándo uh tienes libre*), laughter in combination with several repetitions of the L1 word 'wait,' constitutes a crucial part of the utterance, indicating to the NS that even though there is trouble, she wants to continue. By 23, the NNS has produced enough interpretable speech that the NS is able to

discover her intended meaning and supply a suitable lexical item. The NNS misarticulates it initially,[10] but assembles a grammatical and correctly pronounced noun phrase and correctly pronounces the item in 26.

Example 13/from DS #9C:

99NNS: *Uh, favor de:de pararse allá y cuidarme,* @@@@@@, Uh, please stop there and take care of me.

100NSC: [@@@@@@

101NSMon: [@@@@@@@

102NSM: @@@@@@ *¿Favor de pararse allá y cuidarme?* @@@@@@ @@@@ Please stop there and take care of me? @@@

Vigílame desde allí.
Watch me from there.

NSC and NSMon accept NNS's 'laugh invitation' after NNS laughs at herself in 99. My laughter stems from the fact that I know I have used a non-target construction, but it it one that I feel will suffice and be readily comprehended by my interlocutors. NSC and NSMon's laughter in 100-101 is likely two-fold in that they find humor not only in what I say but in how I say it. In 102 M repeats what I said in 99, surrounds it with laughter, then rephrases my entire utterance in a more appropriate manner. In this case, her laughter softens the FTA.

Laughter can be employed to assume an apologetic stance. In the following example from the service encounter, the NNS uses laughter in mid-utterance to preface an apology for not having the suggested time available for the appointment:

Example 14/from DS #5B:

26NS: *Sí, porque mañana,*
Yes, because tomorrow

tengo un viaje de negocios importante,
I have an important business trip

y no creo que vaya a tener tiempo,
and I don't think that I'm going to have time

para venir para cortarme el cabello.
to come get my hair cut.

27NNS: *No ten@@@@@@@@@go tiempo.*
I don't have time.

Lo siento.
I'm sorry.

28NS: *Bueno, por la mañana.*
Well, in the morning.

Salgo a mediodía.
I leave at noon.

¿En la mañana estás libre?
Are you free in the morning?

29NNS: *Sí.*
Yes.

The participants have spent 20+ turns trying to find a suitable time in the afternoon for the NS, who is playing the role of the customer, to come in for a haircut. So far, they have not been able to agree on anything. In 26, the NS re-states her position. The NNS's response in 27 is riddled with laughter in the middle of the first verb, *tengo*; the second part of her turn contains the apology.

Laughter is also used apologetically in the example below, but in a different manner. The NNS laughs after mispronouncing a word:

Example 15/from DS #8B:

36NS: *Cinco de la tarde.*
5:00 in the afternoon.

37NNS: OK, uh, hac-, ah,
Ok, uh, ma-, ah,

((whispered)) I don't know how to say un appoint-

38NS: *Cita.*
Appointment.

39NNS: *¿Cita?*
Appointment?

Hace, wait, uh, una cita a cinca @@@@@.
Make, wait, uh, an appointment at 5 @@@@@,

¿Sí? Vale.
Yes, OK.

40NS: Vale.
OK.

After having committed two FTAs: 1) to her own positive face in 37 by confessing that she does not know the L2 word for 'appointment,' and 2) to her own negative face in 34 through acceptance of the NS's offering. However, she does make the attempt to use newly-introduced lexical item in the construction of her next utterance in 39. She seems to realize immediately that she has missed the target pronunciation, so she follows it with laughter and an affirmation in an attempt to mitigate the FTA. The NS's affirmative response in 40 indicate his willingness to overlook her *faux pas* and continue the interaction.

Laughter can be used to cover up for a NNS's underdeveloped grammatical proficiency in CLEs. In the

next example, laughter precedes the NNS's inability to respond to his interlocutor's extremely lengthy utterance:

Example 16/from DS #5B:

3NNS: Um, *¿qué tiempo es bueno para tú?*
Um, what time is good for you?

4NS: *Um, el tiempo, tengo,*
Um, the time, I have,

mis horas libres son de once y treinta a doce,
my times are 11:30 to 12:00,

y de tres a cuatro de la tarde.
and from 3:00 to 4:00 in the afternoon.

Y después de las cinco estoy libre.
And after 5:00 I'm free.

Y ¿cuáles, cuáles son las horas que,
And what, what are the times that

Ud. tiene libres para la cita?
you have free for the appointment?

5NNS: Um, @@@@@@@, I don't know what you said.

6NS: *Tres horas libres,*
Three free times

cuándo tú puedes cortarme el cabello.
When can you cut my hair.

7NNS: Uh-uh.
Uh-uh (indicator of non-understanding)

8NS: *¿A qué hora?*
At what time?

¿A qué hora tú puedes darme la cita?
When can you give me the appointment?

9NNS: Uh, *mis horas son nueve a diez,*
Uh, my times are 9:00 to 10:00,

doce a uno, y no tengo horas completas.
12:00 to 1:00, and I don't have full hours.

In 5, laughter is sandwiched between a discourse marker and an apology in the NNS's L1. In the interim, however, the NNS is able to interpret the NS's previouly intelligible utterance after two rounds of simplification, to tres horas libres, then to *¿A qué hora? (used twice)*, the latter of which resulted in comprehension by the NNS. His response in 9 demonstrates persistence in continuing the interaction, and he is able to put the burden back on the NS to proceed.

At times, however, rephrasals by NSs do not result in comprehension. In the example below, the NS's verbose turn is too much for the NNS to process:

Example 17/from DS #5B:

17NNS: *Sólo tengo de tres y media a cuatro.*
I only have 3:30 until 4:00.

18NS: *OK. A lo mejor vengo a esa hora si me,*
Ok. I'd better come then if I,

porque a las cuatro tengo una cita con el doctor,
because at 4:00 I have an appointment with the dr.

y muy corto el tiempo.
and very little time.

19NNS: @@@@@@@@@@

20NS: *¿Me entiendes?*
Do you understand me?

21NNS: No, @@@@@@@@@@.

22NS: OK. *Muy poco tiempo para cortarme el cabello.*
OK. Very little time to cut my hair.

23NNS: Ummm, *porque a la ???*
Ummm, because at ???

Um, *lo necesita hoy?*
Um, do you need it today?

24NS: *Sí, porque mañana tengo un viaje de negocios ...*
Yes, because tomorrow I have a business trip ...

The NNS's laughing response in 19 comes in lieu of words as a respone to the NS's lengthy utterance in 18. In 20, the NS poses the very threatening question *¿Me entiendes?*, to which the NNS has no choice to answer with a confession that he does not, and he uses laughter as a mitigator and as an FSA in order to relinquish the floor to the NS since he is incapable of formulating a response. This buys him some time until 23 when he is able to verbalize his thoughts, fortunately in a manner comprehensible to the NS.

Laughter can also be used to mitigate prior to rejection of an offer. In the example below, the NNS laughs at the NS's suggestion in 19, knowing that she is about to refuse his proposition:

Example 18/from DS #7B:

18NNS: *Uh, um, la salón es fini a las 5.*
Uh, um, the salon is fini at 5.

19NS: *Es bueno. Ok.*
That's good. Ok.

Entonces, a las cinco voy a estar aquí.
Then at 5 I'm gonna be here.

20NNS: @@@@@.

21NS: *¿Está bien?*
Is that OK?

22NNS: *NO. La salón, ah, la salón es, uh,*
NO. The salon ah, the salon is, uh,

¿cómo se dice "closed"?
how do you say "closed"?

23NS: *Está cerra(d)o.*
It is closed.

In 18 the NNS says that the salon is *fini* (intending to mean 'closed') at 5:00. The NS takes this cue and offers to come in at closing time. In 20, the NNS laughs at the his suggestion, an FTA, but also a way to mitigate the upcoming dispreferred response, knowing that she is going to be rejecting his offer in her next turn. When he asks in 21 if that's OK, she responds with an emphatic "No," to re-emphasize that the salon is closed at that time (and with the concomitant implication that she is not prepared to work overtime). In 22, she asks directly for the word in Spanish so that she can correctly verbalize her thoughts. The NS complies with her request in 23.

My comments and laughter in the next example demonstrate understanding, while my laughter in 139 is sarcastic:

Example 19/from DS #9C:

131NSJM: *[El palo que tenía el Presidente Roose [velt,*
[The stick that President Roosevelt had

132NNS: [Walk softly and carry a big heh stick @@@@@@

133NSJM: [@@@@@ *éso es un gar [rote.*
[@@@@@ that's a gar [rote.

134NSM: [@@@@@, *garro [te.*

135NSC: [*Mami...*
[Mommy...

136NSM: *Dime.*
What?

137NSC: *Le quería decir que: con un palo ... ???*
I wanted to say that: with a stick ... ???

138NSJM: *Es como la política que usaba,*
It's like the politics that he used

que parecía simpá [tico,
that *seemed nice*

139 NNS: [@@@@@@@@

140NSJM: *[con los otros países, pero tenía,*
[with other countries, but he had

un garrote abrochado cuando descuidaban.
a big stick over them when they weren't looking.

JM is explaining the term *garrote* while I indicate with my laughter that I do not agree with JM's description of Roosevelt's politics as seeming 'nice' and expects his following comments to contain something sarcastic. This ability to anticipate what might be coming next suggests a link between Carrell's (1995) notions of joke and humor competence and increased L2 proficiency. My laughter in 139 demonstrates a certain level of L2 humor competence. Furthermore, any doubting comment is a potential FTA in that the speaker displays some negative evaluation of the hearer's positive face. In this particular instance, however, the laughter was not intended as an FTA but as an interpretation of JM's use of simpático (nice) mitigated by the verb parecía (seemed).

5.5.2 NS Laughter

NS laughter is an added dimension that NNSs must contend with because it may be especially difficult for them to interpret. L2 speakers, particularly those with limited proficiency, may perceive laughter in a more negative and threatening way than might have been intended, especially if their interlocutors are unfamiliar and/or uncooperative.[11] In short, a NNS may fear that s/he is being laughed at.

However, in more amicable situations, NSs can use laughter to create a non-threatening conversational atmosphere or to diminish the force of a potential FTA. Moreover, NS laughter can invite NNSs to join in, their resulting shared laughter acknowledging the error and showing 'like-minded orientation towards the laughable item' (Glenn 1989:140). Laughter can be used in a joking manner to tease[12], amuse, display intimacy or frame an interaction as playful (Glenn 1987; cf. Brody 1991; Glenn and Knapp 1987). In addition to carrying information about the content of the conversation, shared laughter may display the nature of the interpersonal relationships.

As a comment on form, laughter can function metalinguistically to allow interlocutors to 'point to and agree on what is a funny construction or word choice' (Norrick 1994:17). In the example below, I use laughter as a buffer to my utterance:

Example 20/from DS #9C:

99NNS: *Uh, favor de:de pararse allá y cuidarme, @@@@@@,*
Uh, please stop there and take care of me.

100NSC: [@@@@@@

101NSMon: [@@@@@@@

102NSM: @@@@@@ *¿Favor de pararse allá y cuidarme?* @@@@@@
@@@@ Please stop there and take care of me? @@@

Vigilame desde allí.
Watch me from there.

103NNS: *Y lo hizo.*
And he did it.

104NSM: *¿Sí?*
He did?

105 NNS: Uh-huh.

My laugher in 99 leaves the door open for a correction. Although what I have said is completely comprehensible, in 102, NSM rephrases what I have said in 99 to express the concept in a more locally appropriate manner. I have used a stilted command form, and she adjusts the form of the imperative, the verb -- *cuidar* to *vigilar* -- and changes both into the *tú* (informal) form. In doing so she "identifies a whole stretch of speech in need of correction" (Norrick 1989:7). NSM's correction, as well as her laughter, could certainly be interpreted as FTAs since she appears to be laughing at what I have said. But I did not interpret this laughter as being critical. On the contrary, I accepted it in a teaching spirit, which gave me a chance to learn a new verb, as well as join in the shared laughter (Norrick 1993). The open and intimate nature of

the relationship between my host family and me fostered my acceptance of NSM's rephrasal so that I did not feel threatened by the correction.

Participants continue to comment on the soap opera, which elicits several occurrences of laughter by NSs and myself alike. NSM seems rather amused by the expression I use to describe one of the women:

Example 21/from DS #9C:

22NNS: *¡Qué vestido!=*
What a dress!

23NSC: =M(@@@)m=

24NNS: *=¡qué piernita!*
what legs!

25NSC: [@@@@@@@@

26NNS: [@@@@@@@

27 Mon: *Eso es ???*
That is ???

28NSJM: *Fea.*
Ugly.

29NSM: *Fea del carajo pero tiene un cuerpo...*
Ugly as sin, but she has a body...

.
.
.

34NSM: *Tanto bonito y tiene mal cuerpo.*
So pretty and has a bad body.

¡Qué vestido, qué piernita!=
What a dress, what legs!

35NNS: =@@@@@

In 22 and 24 I comment on the body parts and clothing of one of the women on TV; NSC responds with laughter in 23

and 25. I respond with my own laughter in 26. Later, in 34, M repeats my exact words from 22 and 24, causing me to laugh.[13]

The social nature of laughter can also help to establish individuals as members of a group (Willis 1965). People may laugh to maintain group loyalty or to gain group acceptance (Giles and Oxford 1970:97ff). The wants and desires of speaker(s) and hearer(s) coincide (Brown and Levinson 1987:101ff) as laughter is used as a marker of solidarity that 1) teases in a manner that stresses shared background or values and 2) uses slang or jargon to confirm in-group identity. The hearer laughter in the next example particularly highlights the operation of positive politeness:

Example 22/from DS #9C:

141NSM: *Dale una cacha [da*
Give him a whomp...

142NNS: [*¡un chinga: [zo!/*
[a bop!

143NSC: [@@@@ [@@@@@@@@

144NSM: [*¡AY, AY, AY!*

145NSJM: *Un palo*[14]*, un chingazo,* @@@@@@@@@@@@
A stick, a bop, @@@@@@@@@@@@

146NSM: *Mira cómo le gustó...*AH:hah!
Look how he liked it...AH:hah!

The lexical item I use in 142 is quite strong in much of the Spanish-speaking world. After I utter it and NSC (age 10) laughs, NSM (NSC's mother) attempts to mitigate the

obscene possibility of my word choice with her utterance in 144, but NSJM (NSC's father) repeats my words, *un palo* and *un chingazo*, from prior turns in 145. He laughs in acknowledgement of and appreciation for my use of *mexicanismos*. In 146 NSM decides that, since NSJM was not offended by what I have said, she will share in the laughter as well.

5.5.3 Summary of Functions of Laughter

The prior sections have elucidated a variety of functions of laughter in CLEs. In my analysis I have provided examples of laughter by both NSs and NNSs. Laughter was demonstrated to enhance certain FSAs in the service encounter data (cf. examples #5 and #8 from Sec. 5.4.2.1). Laughter was included in NNSs' utterances 1) when they were unable to interpret NSs' utterances (example #11, #16 and #17), 2) when they lacked a particular lexical item (examples #12 and #15), 3) when NNSs knowingly used non-target constructions -- involving either grammar or pronunciation (example #15), 4) when they (posing as hairstylists) could not schedule an appointment at the suggested time (example #14) or were planning to reject an offer (example #18). My laughter (as a more proficient NNS) indicated understanding and sarcasm (example #19), but was used to buffer the use of a non-target construction as well (example #13).

Throughout the conversational data, laughter seemed to be evoked by utterances that were not really incorrect, but just not quite the way that NSs would normally express themselves. Therefore, what I said just "sounded funny." NS laughter, then, function metalinguistically as a comment on form (example #20), but without the normal face-threatening force carried by many such occurrences. Laughter was used as a marker of solidarity and to tease me (example #22).

5.6 Classification of Laughter

Based on the prior analysis, I have developed a framework[15] for classifying the myriad functions of laughter in my data. It is by no means a complete categorization of all of laughter's functions, but it provides the opportunity to gain a greater understanding of what laughter accomplishes in my data and offers a base which can be expanded for other types of interactions. It also shows how laughter's functions can overlap. Table I accounts for both face-saving and face-threatening functions of laughter and identifies three domains of laughter: metalinguistic, evaluative and joking. The numbers listed by each function refer to examples which have been discussed previously.

Speakers engage in metalinguistic actions when, in addition to taking their turn, they comment on speech or attempt to regulate speech itself. It could be argued

that all talk works to regulate talk, but laughter seems to function particularly well in this respect. Laughter can be used evaluatively by both speakers and hearers to express an attitude about what was said or done. Speaker laughter tells how the speaker understands a particular utterance; hearer laughter can provide an assessment of how listeners interpret what has been said. Laughter can be used in a joking manner to display intimacy or frame an interaction as playful (Brody 1991).

5.7 Summary

The data presented here reveal a diversity of functions of laughter in conversation. It may be used by speaker or hearer to respond to, reflect on or embellish what has been said previously. These interactions illustrated both face-saving and face-threatening functions of laughter. A powerful interactional force, laughter has a light side that invites support and agreement as well as a darker side that challenges or ridicules.

The overall positive tone of the free conversation coupled with the noticeable intimacy between family members and myself, demonstrates how laughter can break down the separation of face and diminish the force of certain FTAs. This is due to the fact that all of the conversational examples are in the context of 1) advanced speaker, 2) high motivation, 3) great good will and 4) interaction with people I had come to know well. The service encounter

TABLE 3. Interactional Functions of Laughter

Domain	Face-saving Functions	Face-threatening Functions
Metalinguistic	Backchannelling device Response (21) Topic-ending indicator (9) Negotiate grammar & meaning (13) Show understanding (19) Cover mistake (8,12,15) Inability to formulate utterance or respond (6,11,16,17)	Comment on form (20)
Evaluative	Agree Reinforce/support (21) Accept (3,10) Express amusement [by S] (10) Mitigate Prior to rejection (14,18)	Express amusement [by H] (2,5,10) Disagree Challenge (1,7) Doubt (2)
Joking	Confirm in-group identity (22) Tease (22)	Taunt (4) Sarcasm (19)

examples contrast on all fronts. A different distribution of the functions of laughter would necessarily be found in other interactions. Thus, in order to correctly classify the many occurrences of conversational laughter, both context and the relationship between interlocutors must be carefully considered.

5.8 End Notes

1. Scollon and Scollon (1995) call any communication a risk to face -- one's own as well as that of one's interlocutor(s). According to these researchers, 'There is no faceless communication' (p. 38).

2. See Tannen 1984 for a discussion of conversational style.

3. It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to analyze the cultural differences of laughter. Future research could certainly address this aspect.

4. Glenn (1989:137) sees laughing at one's own laughable material as 'engaging in self-praise, akin to a public speaker applauding herself for making an effective oratorical point.' This is plausible, but certainly not always true.

5. Note that the expletive used in this case was done so in NNS's L1, a strategy that helped to avoid a taboo in the L2.

6. Misunderstanding is even more common in CLEs.

7. See Jefferson (1994) for a further discussion of responses to speaker laughter where she uses the terms 'laugh-receptive' and 'laugh resistant.'

8. It is interesting to see the NS's accommodation to the NNS's use of a.m., a way of expressing 'in the morning' borrowed from her L1.

9. According to Provine (1996:41), "people are about 30 times more likely to laugh when they are in a social situation than when they are alone."

10. Refer to note 5, Chapter 3.

11. The degree of cooperation between interlocutors has been shown to have a direct bearing on the outcome of a given interaction (cf. Brenneis 1986; Duranti 1986; Stewart and Pearson 1995; Stewart 1996a, 1996b).

12. Teasing can, however, set up a laughing *at* rather than a laughing *with* relationship that has the potential for creating a hostile situation. For further discussion on teasing and ambiguity, see Brody (1991).

13. See Norrick (1994) for more information on repetition as a conversational joking strategy.

14. In Cuba, *palo* is often used to refer to the male sex organ. That would parallel the obscene meaning of *chingazo*, which is based on the vulgar verb *chingar*, 'to fuck.' Thanks to Hugh Buckingham for this observation.

15. This table incorportes ideas from Labov and Fanshell (1977) with many of my own.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Summary

6.1.1 Goals and Realizations

The goals of this research have been several: 1) to discover the details of how CLEs work, 2) to isolate CLEs as the dialogic locus of SLA, 3) to illustrate that interaction with NSs is crucial to SLA and 4) to demonstrate how L2 linguistic ability develops in the interactional process. The approach to these goals has required bringing together linguistic, social and psychological theories, as CLEs (and SLA) involve all three.

I have used an interactional sociolinguistic perspective in the analysis of my data. This basically functional approach to discourse posits an intimate relationship between language and context and focusses on the social nature of interaction, a point which has also drawn attention in SLA. Both language and interaction are social processes, so we need social theory in order to understand them. Although I did not focus strongly on the psychological aspects of CLEs, the pedagogical facets of Vygotskyan theory are important to show how learners can derive benefit from interactions with more capable peers;

this notion extends to grammar, which is seen to develop, or emerge, in the process of spoken interaction.

A central tenet of my investigation has been the notion of the dialogic, which showcases the *direct* relationship of utterances to interlocutors and to other utterances, because each utterance "receives part of its meaning from what another person offered before and gives part of its meaning back to that other person to use in what comes next" (Schiffrin 1994:352). This is precisely because conversation (as well as other types of spoken interaction) involves more than just an exchange of information - it includes many assumptions and expectations shared by interlocutors as well. Highlighting the link between interactive and social aspects of CLEs has allowed me to examine aspects of language that are most pertinent to language learning.

By looking at problems specific to CLEs as a type of conversational interaction, I have provided some insight into the communication process in general. In particular, my investigation has revealed much about the nature of conversation, so results should be useful not only to those who are exploring the role of interaction in SLA but also to those who are studying L1 conversation. Because scholars are still investigating how best to study language, social interaction, and psychology outside of the

normal realm of everyday discourse, results of my study better suggest what that norm might be.

This study also offers some insight into the study of cross-cultural communication. Referential meaning alone is insufficient for the correct interpretation of speaker intent, if intent is indeed interpretable at all. Speakers' intentions and hearers' interpretations of those intentions must be congruent in order for successful communication to occur. Oftentimes, in CLEs, there is a misunderstanding due to contrasting cultural presuppositions. Moreover, even though miscommunication may be mutual, attempts to repair the breakdown are often one-sided; at times, they do not occur at all. Interlocutors in CLEs who are more informed and better tactically and strategically equipped are more likely to be willing to venture into the arena of L2 conversation and to persevere in their interactions.

6.1.2 Limitations of This Study

Undoubtedly the most prominent drawback to this investigation is the paucity of data upon which it is based. However, much was revealed in the process of analysis, so the potential is great for replication and expansion of this line of research in Spanish, as well as other languages. This investigation could easily serve as a springboard for a larger study.

Also, all of the NNSs involved in this study volunteered to be a part of this project, indicating that they were a certain kind of student: somewhat adventuresome and willing to take a risk. This can be seen in responses to the questionnaire administered to students in Situation #1b, the results of which are recapped in Appendix C. These particular students 1) enjoyed taking Spanish (avg. 4.0), 2) enjoyed speaking Spanish in class (avg. 3,25), 3) want to travel to a Spanish-speaking country to "try out" their skills (avg. 4.25) and 4) enjoyed the speaking task (avg. 4.25), certainly not the profile of the typical beginning learner. Results would necessarily be different if other types of students had been included in the database.

A portion of the Dominican data remained unintelligible, even though I had two Caribbean speakers of Spanish listen to the tapes multiple times. Future work demands better recording equipment. In addition, the use of video in future recordings could capture even more information that would be valuable in the analysis.

Finally, I did not address any of the cultural aspects of either laughter or face. There is much potential for further work in this area with the same data.

6.2 What Goes On in CLEs?

This investigation has provided a wealth of descriptive information for what goes on in CLEs. Because they do not fully share the TL, interlocutors in CLEs must engage in the process of negotiation. Negotiation is significant in that it unites linguistic, social and cognitive processes, all of which can contribute to SLA. As discussed in Chapter 1, analysis of negotiated interaction is vital to understanding the SLA process because it demonstrates 1) how learners accept unknown L2 input and how they react to feedback on their L2 production, 2) the role of NSs in expediting the process of SLA and the contributions they make to a learner's emergent grammar and 3) how the use of particular tactics and strategies can influence the balance of power in CLEs.

In order to communicate, discourse participants create and search for structures, convey meanings and accomplish actions, all of which are infused with power inequalities of various dimensions. CLEs are particularly complex examples of this process. By bringing in socially-based concept involving the implementation of tactics on the part of the weak and strategies on the part of the strong, I have highlighted a previously ignored dimension of CLEs. Taking into account how these actions are realized can reveal much about the process of SLA, and accommodation theory was valuable in helping to elucidate this point.

6.3 The Tactics and Strategies of Interactional Grammar

An analysis of these data has revealed that even NNSs with limited interactional experience were capable of employing a variety of tactics to make themselves understood. In other instances, they were able to convince their NS interlocutor to do so, exhibiting the power of the weak. NSs operated from their place of power as knowers of the language. They employed strategies that either helped or hindered the CLE. I was able to make these various interactional devices, which are used by both NSs and NNSs, salient through detailed analysis of the emergent grammar of CLEs.

I have illustrated that the linguistic mechanism of repetition functions on distinct, yet interrelated levels: production, comprehension, discourse, interpersonal and interactional. Repair, which is the means by which speakers stop and start over, was shown in my data to be a frequent occurrence in CLEs. Both repair and error were reinterpreted as forms of regulation of speech and as a natural part of the learning process, respectively. These two interactional devices, when considered within the context of each interaction, were better understood as potential face threats. By paying special attention to interlocutors and the level of accommodation they exhibited, I was able to make delicate judgments about the amount of risk posed to a particular speaker/hearer's face.

Laughter was revealed to be an integral component of CLEs, with a variety of manifestations and interpretations. As with regulation, the face threat of laughter was shown to be contingent upon the nature of the interaction, the relationship between interlocutors and the accommodation level of participants.

6.4 CLEs: A Revised Perspective

A successful spoken interaction, then, is a shared achievement based on the interlocutors' ability to engage their conversational partner(s) in cooperative efforts. Enticing cooperation, however, can require both effort and skill, because some verbal exchanges are not cooperative and not all interlocutors are accommodating. In CLEs particularly, cooperation is rarely unidimensional, and depends on a variety of factors that are grammatical, social and psychological.

Analysis of my data offers support for the claim that grammar is "secondary to discourse" (Hopper 1988:121), and highlights the notion of interactional grammar. While traditional grammar refers to specific linguistic structures, the language used for communication encompasses much more, including how speakers say things, to whom and why; what their messages mean and how meaning is negotiated between interlocutors; and the power relationships between those interlocutors. These are exactly those aspects of language use that have been revealed in my data. My

discussion of the power/status relationship between interlocutors in CLEs has comprised both accommodation level and the role of tactics and strategies. Results of this study lend support to the argument for development of interactional proficiency as a means to equalize the power imbalance that necessarily exists within CLEs, because it is in the actual use of language that grammatical (as well as all other types) of proficiency develops.[1]

6.5 Achieving Interactional Proficiency in CLEs

I have mentioned a number of investigations undertaken over the years into what makes a good language learner (refer to Sec. 2.5.2). Many of these same behaviors also appear to enhance one's overall communicative abilities. In earlier work, a colleague and I suggested several characteristics of successful CLEs (Stewart and Pearson 1995). Combining those characteristics with the results of this research, I have formulated a model of interactional proficiency that embodies information concerning tactics and strategies that were useful to interlocutors in these data and constitute information which should be advantageous to any participant in CLEs.[2]

Strategies revealed in the data to be successful for NSs in these CLEs include the following: 1) don't "talk down" to NNSs; rather, be helpful whenever possible; 2) listen more intently and articulate more clearly than usual; 3) modify utterances via simplification or

elaboration; 4) offer to supply missing words or phrases; 5) use high frequency vocabulary and syntax; 6) be aware of the possible negative interpretations of laughter; and, above all, 7) be patient.

Tactics shown to be beneficial for NNSs in these CLEs include the following: 1) concentrate on what is understood rather than becoming overwhelmed by what is not; 2) make educated guesses; 3) activate any available tactics in cases of linguistic deficiency; 4) take risks even in the 'face' of making a mistake; 5) invite utterance completions; 6) ask for clarification when misunderstanding seems eminent; 7) learn how to laugh at yourself, remembering that laughter can enhance many FSAs and can help extricate you from interactional difficulty; 8) search out all opportunities possible for using the TL, especially with NSs; 9) closely observe what NSs do to navigate communicative obstacles and attempt to emulate their strategic moves; and, above all, 10) be persistent in your interactions with NSs (cf. Hatch 1978).

One caveat is in order with regards to the above model: some of the suggested maneuvers are inherently face-threatening and must be employed cautiously. However, because the environment of CLEs is inherently face-threatening, interlocutors must naturally be willing to relinquish a certain amount of face in order to take the necessary risks of L2 interaction that will inevitably

cause face-loss. Increased interaction may enhance proficiency and also foster learners' confidence.

6.6 Pedagogical Implications and Directions for Further Research

This study has significant implications for SLA and FLT. Grammar learning has traditionally been about establishing form-meaning connections, i.e. learning to link a piece of grammar with its meaning for the purpose of building an L2 grammatical system. However, effective development of any L2 grammatical system presupposes a reason for its use, and all the reasons are in fact social. Thus, I have argued for the pairing of NSs and NNSs on the grounds that the development of L2 proficiency can be facilitated when learners are in direct contact with more capable peers who can guide them through the learning process.

In order to determine if interactions with NSs is a pedagogically profitable endeavor, we would need to implement these types of interactions into the curriculum and devise a means for evaluating their effectiveness. Such a program could perhaps be designed on a multi-tiered basis: 1) actively pairing lower-level students with each other in a variety of task-oriented and role play activities; 2) teaming lower-level students with upper-level students, who can serve as grammar resources for one another; 3) coupling intermediate students with NSs.

The very nature of language learning demands that instruction address all aspects of communicative proficiency. While there is little disagreement that tactics help to bridge the gap between what learners are capable of expressing and what they want to express, there is some debate over whether they should be overtly taught, or even if they can be taught (or learned). Yet, if our goal is to teach a foreign language, why would we fall short by failing to equip students with the best means possible for functioning in the TL? Results of my pilot study have shown that even beginning learners have some access to tactics that can assist them in CLEs -- their willingness and ability to employ these maneuvers appears to vary by individual and by interaction. Future research would need to compare groups of learners with and without tactical instruction to determine if knowledge about tactics and strategies really makes a difference in their overall performance.

Few of the students involved in this investigation had had previous interactions with NSs outside of their instructors[3] (see Appendix D for detailed information). Yet there are an array of NSs available as a resource in many places. A key opportunity appears to exist at any university with an English language program for pairing NSs of Spanish with learners of Spanish (or other languages, for that matter). In exchange for NSs' participation in

such a program, it could be to their benefit to offer them a conversation swap in English. Future research could analyze the speech (both English and Spanish) of these pairings. With a larger sample, the hypotheses I have put forth in my conclusion could be confirmed, denied or refined. Implemetation of this program would involve a number of logistical problems. Although difficult, the problems should not be insurmountable, and gradual implementation would allow further testing, analysis and refinement of the procedures.

Further dialogue between researchers and practitioners is mandated if we ever hope to narrow the gap between our pedagogical competence and performance. Although we have volumes of knowledge about what comprises the process of language learning, as teachers we have largely failed to employ that knowledge in the classroom. How do we encourage those in charge of teacher education to be more open to the possibilities that exist?[4] How can we best expose teachers-in-training to collaborative and interactive learning techniques and situations so that they will be more likely to integrate them into their own classrooms? I believe that many of the answers lie in becoming more pro-active in our approach to language learning and teaching so that both processes become more interesting and more effective for students and teachers alike.

6.7 End Notes

1. See VanPatten (1998) who concurs with me when he says that "the internalization of grammar and language is an ongoing process of communication -- i.e. *the interpretation, expression and negotiation of meaning may precede and actually cause second language acquisition*" (p. 928, italics in original).

2. While little of this information is "new," it is being presented in a unique context. Strategies for reading are now commonplace entries in beginning textbooks -- why should not some of the same types of information be included for beginning students who are engaged in the inherently difficult task of speaking and listening? See Saz (1996), which is an entire volume of strategies for learning Spanish. See also Swaffar and Bacon (1993).

3. The average score on question 21 of the attitude survey administered to students in Situation #1b was 4.75.

4. According to VanPatten (1998) "probably *less than 1% of the entire language professorate in the U.S. is a specialist in applied linguistics related to language learning and teaching*" (p. 931, italics in original version). This finding which is unlikely to have changed significantly in the last decade, comes from Teschner 1987.

REFERENCES

ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines (1986). Hastings-on-Hudson, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Aljaafreh, Ali and James P. Lantolf (1994). Negative Feedback as Regulation and Second Language Learning in the Zone of Proximal Development. Modern Language Journal (78)4:465-483.

Abdesslem, Habib (1996). Communication strategies or discourse strategies in foreign language performance? International Review of Applied Linguistics (XXXIV)1:49-61.

Ahmed, Mohammed K. (1994). Speaking As Cognitive Regulation: A Vygotskian Perspective on Dialogic Communication. In Lantolf and Appel (eds.), pp. 157-171.

Ainsworth-Vaughn, Nancy (1998). Claiming Power in Doctor-Patient Talk. Oxford: University Press.

Alatis, James (ed.) (1992). Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1992. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Alba, Orlando (ed.) (1982). El español del caribe: Ponencias del VI Simposio de Dialectología. Santiago, DR: Universidad Católica Madre y Maestra.

Aljaafreh, Ali and James P. Lantolf (1994). Negative Feedback as Regulation and Second Language Learning in the Zone of Proximal Development. Modern Language Journal (78)4:465-483.

Apte, Mahadev L. 1985. Humor and Laughter. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Asher, J. (1982). Learning another language through actions: The complete teacher's guidebook, 2nd. edition. Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks Productions.

Atkinson, J. Maxwell and John Heritage, eds. (1984). Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis. Cambridge: University Press.

Bachman, Lyle F. (1990). Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing. Oxford: University Press.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. (1986). Speech Genres and Other Late Essays. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Baugh, John and Joel Sherzer (eds.) (1984). Language in use: Readings in Sociolinguistics. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Beebe, Leslie. (1988). Five Sociolinguistic Approaches to Second Language Acquisition. In L. Beebe (ed.) Issues in Second Language Acquisition, pp. 41-78. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

----- and H. Giles (1984). Speech-accommodation theories: a discussion in terms of second-language acquisition. International Journal of the Sociology of Language 46:5-32.

----- and Jane Zuengler (1983). Accommodation Theory: An Explanation for Style Shifting in Second Language Dialects. In Wolfson and Judd, pp. 195-213.

Bennett-Kastor, Tina L. (1994). Repetition in Language Development: From Interaction to Cohesion. In B. Johnstone (ed.), Vol. I:155-171.

Berlyne, D. E. (1969). Laughter, Humor and Play. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronsonpp (eds.), Handbook of Social Psychology, pp. 795-852. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Berry-Bravo, Judy (1993). Teaching the Art of Circumlocution. Hispania (76)2:371-377.

Bialystok, Ellen (1978). A theoretical model of second language learning. Language Learning 28:69-84.

----- (1982). On the relationship between knowing and using linguistic fo2Brodyrms. Applied Linguistics (3)2:181-205.

----- (1983). Selection and Implementation of Communication Strategies. In Faerch and Kasper (eds.), pp. 100-119.

----- (1990). Communication Strategies. Oxford: Blackwell.

----- (1993). Symbolic Representation and Attentional Control in Pragmatic Competence. In Kasper and Blum-Kulka (eds.), pp. 43-63.

Bialystok, Ellen and Kenji Hakuta (1994). In Other Words: The Science and Psychology of Second Language Acquisition. New York: Basic Books.

Blas-Arroyo, José Luis (1994). De nuevo sobre el poder y la solidaridad: apuntes para un análisis interaccional de la alternancia *tú/usted*. Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica (42)2:385-414.

Blyth, Carl (1998). The role of grammar in communicative language teaching. McGraw-Hill Teleconference.

Bremer, Katharina, Celia Roberts, Marie Thérèse Vasseur, Margaret Simonot and Peter Broeder (1996). Achieving understanding: Discourse in intercultural encounters. London: Longman.

Bremer, Katharina with M. Simonot (1996). Preventing problems of understanding. In Katharina Bremer et al. (eds.), pp. 159-179.

Brenneis, Donald (1986). Shared territory: audience, interaction and meaning. Text (6)3:339-347.

Brock, Cynthia, Graham Crookes, Richard R. Day and Michael H. Long (1986). Differential Effects of Corrective Feedback in NS/NNS Conversation. In R. Day (ed.), pp. 229-236.

Brody, Jill (1986). Repetition as a Rhetorical and Conversational Device in Tojolob'al [Mayan]. International Journal of American Linguitics 52:255-274.

----- (1991). Indirection in the Negotiation of Self in Everyday Tojolob'al Women's Conversation. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology (1)1:78-96.

----- (1994). Multiple Repetitions in Tojolob'al Conversation. In B. Johnstone (ed.) Repetition in Discourse, Volume II, pp. 3-14.

Brody, Jill (1998). A Linguistic Anthropological Perspective on Language and Culture in the Second Language Curriculum. In Lange *et al.* (eds.), pp. 93-107.

Brooks, Frank (1992a). Communicative competence and the conversation course. Linguistics and Education 4:219-246.

Brooks, Frank (1992b). Spanish III Learners Talking to One Another Through a Jigsaw Task. Canadian Modern Language Review (48)4:696-717.

----- (1992c). Can We Talk? Foreign Language Annals (25)1:59-71.

----- and Richard Donato (1994). Vygotskyan Approaches to Understanding Foreign Language Learner Discourse During Communicative Tasks. Hispania 77(4):262-274.

----- and Victor McGlone (1996). Are you Skeptical Too? Introducing Information Gap Activities Into the Foreign Language Classroom. Paper presented at the Southern Conference on Language Teaching, Mobile, AL.

Brown, Gillian and George Yule (1983). Discourse Analysis. Cambridge: University Press.

Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge: University Press.

Brown, Roger and Albert Gilman (1960). The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity. In T. Sebeok (ed.) Style in Language, pp. 253-278. Cambridge, Ma: MIT Press.

Bublitz, Wolfram (1988). Supportive Fellow Speakers and Cooperative Conversation. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Burling, Robbins (1992). Patterns of Language. San Diego: Academic Press.

Canale, Michael (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In Richards and Schmidt (eds.), pp. 2-28.

----- and M. Swain (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. Applied Linguistics (1)1:1-47.

Carrell, Amy (1995). Linguistic Competence: A Multi-faceted Construct. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the South Central Modern Language Association, Houston, Texas.

Carrier, Karen (1999). The Social Environment of Second Language Listening: Does Status Play a Role in Comprehension? Modern Language Journal (83)1:65-79.

de Castells, Matilde Olivella, Ricardo Castells and María González-Aguilar (1994). Mosaicos: Spanish as a World Language. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Celce-Murcia, Marianne (1985). Making informed decisions about the role of grammar in language teaching. *TESOL* Newsletter (19)1:4-5.

----- with Z. Dörnyei and S. Thurrell (1994). Reconsidering communicative competence. Journal of Intensive English Studies, pp. 57-67.

de Certeau, Michel (1984). The Practice of Everyday Life. Berkeley: University of California Press.

----- (1987). Cognitive constraints on information flow. In R. Tomlin (ed.) Coherence and grounding in discourse, pp. 21-52. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

----- (1994). Discourse, consciousness and time. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chapman, A. J. and Foot (eds.) (1976). Humor and Laughter: Theory, Research and Applications. London: Wiley and Sons.

Chastain, Kenneth (1987). Examining the Role of Grammar Explanation, Drills and Exercises in the Development of Communication Skills. Hispania 70:160-166.

Chomsky, Noam (1965). Aspects of the theory of syntax. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chun, Ann, Richard Day, Ann Chenoweth and Stuart Luppescu (1982). Errors, interaction and correction: a study of native-nonnative conversations. TESOL Quarterly (16)4:537-547.

Corder, S. Pit (1967). The significance of learner's errors. International Review of Applied Linguistics 9:147-159.

Coulmas, Frederick (1981). Festschrift for Native Speaker. The Hague: Mouton.

Coupland, Nikolas, Justine Coupland, Howard Giles and Karen Henwood. Accommodating the elderly: Invoking and extending a theory. Language in Society 17:1-41.

Cox, Martha G. (1982). Accounting for Speaker Laughter - Regularities in the content of utterances 'said with a laugh.' Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association. Washington, DC.

Craig, Robert T., Karen Tracy and Frances Spisak (1986). The Discourse of Requests: Assessment of a Politeness Approach. Human Communication Research (12)4:437-468.

Curran, C. (1976). Counseling-learning in second languages, Apple River, IL: Apple River Press.

Davis, Kathy (1988). Power under the Microscope. Dordrecht: ICG.

Davis, Philip W. (ed.) (1995). Alternative Linguistics: Descriptive and Theoretical Modes. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Day, Richard (ed.).(1986). Talking to Learn: Conversation in Second Language Acquisition, Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

----- N. Ann Chenoweth, Ann E. Chun and Stuart Luppescu (1984). Corrective Feedback in Native-Nonnative Discourse. Language Learning 34:19-45.

Di Pietro, Robert J. (1987). Strategic Interaction. Cambridge: University Press.

----- (1990). Roles in the Foreign Language Classroom. In A. Labarca and L. Bailey (eds.), pp. 1-9.

Donato, Richard (1994). Collective Scaffolding in Second Language Learning.

----- and James Lantolf (1990). The Dialogic Origins of L2 Monitoring. In L. Bouton and Y. Kachru (eds.) Pragmatics and Language Learning, Volume I, pp. 83-98. Urbana-Champaign, IL: Division of English as an International Language.

----- and Bonnie Adair-Hauck (1992). Discourse perspectives on formal instruction. Language Awareness (1)2:73-89.

Dörnyei, Zoltán (1995). On the Teachability of Communication Strategies. TESOL Quarterly (29)1:55-85.

Dörnyei, Zoltán (1997). Psychological Processes in Cooperative Language Learning: Group Dynamics and Motivation. Modern Language Journal (81)4:482-493.

----- and Sarah Thurrell (1991). Strategic competence and how to teach it. ELT Journal 45:6-38.

Doughty, Catherine and Teresa Pica (1986). Information gap tasks: Do they facilitate second language acquisition? *TESOL* Quarterly (20)2:305-325.

Duranti, Alessandro (1986). The Audience as co-author: an introduction. Text (6)3:239-247.

----- and Charles Goodwin (eds.) (1992). Rethinking Context. Cambridge: University Press.

Eckman, F., D. Highland, R. Lee, J. Mileham and R. Rutowsky Weber (eds.) (1995). Second Language Acquisition Theory and Pedagogy. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Edelsky, Carol (1981). Who's Got the Floor? Language in Society 10:383-421.

Edmonson, Munro (1952). Los Manitos: Patterns of Humor in Relation to Cultural Values. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation: Harvard University.

----- 1987. Notes on laughter. Anthropological Linguistics (29)1:23-34.

Ellis, Rod (1985). Understanding Second Language Acquisition. Oxford; University Press.

----- (1992). The Classroom Context: An Acquisition-Rich or an Acquisition-Poor Environment? In. C. Kramsch and S. McConnell-Ginet (eds.), pp. 171-186.

Erickson, Frederick (1976). Gatekeeping Encounters: A Social Selection Process. In P. Sanday (ed.) Anthropology and the Public Interest, pp. 111-145. New York: Academic Press.

Faerch, Claude and Gabrielle Kasper (1980). Processes and Strategies in Foreign Language Learning and Communication. Interlanguage Studies Bulletin Utrecht 5:47-118.

----- (eds.) (1983a). Strategies in Interlanguage Communication, London: Longman.

Faerch, Claude and Gabrielle Kasper (1983b). Plans and Strategies in Foreign Language Communication. In Faerch & Kasper (eds.), pp. 20-60.

----- (1984a). Two Ways of Defining Communication Strategies. Language Learning (34)1:45-63.

----- (1984b). Pragmatic Knowledge: Rules and Procedures. Applied Linguistics (5)3:214-225.

Fairclough, Norman (1989). Language and Power. London and New York: Longman.

Ferrara, Kathleen (1991). Accommodation in Therapy. In Giles et al., pp. 187-222.

----- (1992). The interactive achievement of a sentence: joint productions in therapeutic discourse. Discourse Processes 15:207-228.

----- (1994). Therapeutic Repetition: Echoing and Mirroring. In B. Johnstone (ed.), Volume II, pp. 66-83.

Foley, J. (1991). A psycholinguistic framework for task-based approaches to language teaching. Applied Linguistics 12:62-75.

Ford, Cecilia (1993). Grammar in interaction: adverbial clauses in English conversations. Cambridge: University Press.

----- and Sandra A. Thompson (1996). Interactional Units in Conversation: Syntactic, Intonational and Pragmatic Resources for the Management of Turns. In Ochs, Schegloff and Thompson (eds.), pp. 134-184.

----, Barbara A. Fox and Sandra A. Thompson (1995). Practices in the construction of turns: the 'TCU' revisited. Paper presented at the Symposium on Conversation, Albuquerque, NM, July 14-16.

Fotos, S. and R. Ellis (1991). Communicating about grammar: A task-based approach. *TESOL* Quarterly 25:608-628.

Fraser, Bruce (1990). Perspectives on Politeness. Journal of Pragmatics 14:219-236.

Frawley William (1997). Vygotsky and cognitive science. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Frawley William and James Lantolf (1985). Second Language Acquisition: A Vygotskyan Perspective. Applied Linguistics (6)1:19-44.

Gaies, S. J. (1982). Modifications of discourse between native speaker and nonnative speaker peers. ED#221067.

Garrod, Simon (1986). Language Comprehension in Context: A Psychological Perspective. Applied Linguistics 7(3): 226-238.

Gaskill, William H. (1980). Correction in Native Speaker-Nonnative Speaker Conversation. In D. Larsen-Freeman (ed.), pp. 125-137.

Gass, Susan, Alison Mackey and Teresa Pica (1998). The Role of Input and Intreaction in Second Language Acquisition: Introcution to the Special Issue. Modern Language Journal (82)3:299-305.

Gass, Susan and Carolyn Madden (1985). Input in Second Language Acquisition. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gass, Susan and Sally Dieloff Magnan (1993). Second Language Production: SLA Research in Speaking and Writing. In A. Omaggio Hadley (ed.), [[. 156-197.

Gass, Susan, Dennis Preston and Larry Selinker (eds.) (1989a). Variation in Second Language Acquisition Volume I: Discourse and Pragmatics. Clevedon/Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

----- (1989b). Variation in Second Language Acquisition Volume II: Psycholinguistic Issues. Clevedon/Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Gass, Susan and Larry Selinker (1994). Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gass, Susan and Evangeline Varonis (1985). Task Variation and Nonnative/Nonnative Negotiation of Meaning. In Gass and Madden (eds.), Input in Second Language Acquisition, pp. 149-161. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

----- (1991). Miscommunication in Nonnative Speaker Discourse. In Coupland et al. eds.) Miscommunication and Problematic Talk, pp. 121-145, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gass, Susan and Evangeline Varonis (1994). Input, Interaction and Second Language Production. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 16:283-302.

Gattegno, C. (1972). Teaching Foreign Languages in Schools: The Silent Way. New York: Educational Solutions.

Giles, Howard (1973). Accent mobility: A model and some data. Anthropological Linguistics 15:87-105.

----- and G. S. Oxford (1978). Towards a Multi-dimensional Theory of Laughter Causation and Its Social Implication. Bulletin of the British Psychological Society 22:97-105.

----- , A. Mulac and J. J. Bradac (1987). Speech accommodation theory: The next decade and beyond. In M. McLaughlin (ed.), Communication Yearbook 10:13-48. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Giles, Howard J. Coupland and N. Coupland (eds.) (1991). Contexts of Accommodation. Cambridge: University Press.

Glenn, Phillip J. (1987). Laugh and the World Laughs With You: Shared Laughter Sequencing in Conversation. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.

----- (1989). Initiating Shared Laughter in Multi-Party Conversations. Western Journal of Speech Communications 53:126-49.

----- (1991). Current Speaker Initiation of Two-Party Shared Laughter. Research on Language and Social Interaction 2:139-162.

----- and Mark L. Knapp (1987). The Interactive Framing of Play in Adult Conversations. Communication Quarterly (35)1:48-66.

Goffman, Erving (1967). Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-face Behavior. New York: Pantheon.

----- (1974). Frame Analysis. New York: Harper and Row.

----- (1984). Response Cries. In Baugh and Sherzer (eds.), pp. 100-126.

Goodwin, Charles (1979). The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In G. Psathas (ed.), pp. 97-121.

----- (1981). Conversational organization: interaction between speakers and hearers. New York: Academic Press.

----- (1996). Transparent Vision. In Ochs, Schegloff and Thompson (eds.), pp. 370-404.

Green, Judith L. and Judith O. Harker (1982). Gaining Access to Learning: Conversational, Social, and Cognitive Demands of Group Participation. In L. Wilkinson (ed.), pp. 183-221.

Gregory, J. C. (1924). The Nature of Laughter. London: Kegan Paul.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In C. Peter and J. Morgan (eds.) Syntax and semantics, Vol. 3, pp. 43-58. London: Academic Press.

Grosjean, François (1982). Life with Two languages. Cambridge: Harvard University Press,

Gumperz, John J. (1981). The Linguistic Bases of Communicative Competence. In D. Tannen(ed.) Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk, 323-334. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

----- (1982). Discourse Strategies. Cambridge: University Press.

----- (1984a). Communicative Competence Revisited. In D. Schiffrin (ed.) Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics 1984. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, pp. 278-289.

----- (1984b). The Retrieval of Socio-cultural Knowledge in Conversation. In J. Baugh and J. Sherzer (eds.), pp. 127-138.

----- (1990). The Conversational Analysis of Interethnic Communication. In Scarcella et al. (eds.), 179-194.

----- (1992). Contextualization and understanding. In Duranti and Goodwin (eds.), pp. 229-252.

Halliday M.A.K. and Ruqaiya Hasan (1976). Cohesion in English. London: Longman.

Hatch, Evelyn (1978). Discourse Analysis and Second Language Acquisition. In E. Hatch (ed.) Second Language Acquisition: A Book of Readings, pp. 401-435. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

----- (1983). Simplified input and second language acquisition. In R. Andersen (ed.), 64-86. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

----- (1992). Discourse and Language Education. Cambridge: University Press.

----- and Michael Long (1980). Discourse Analysis: What's That? In D. Larsen-Freeman (ed.), pp. 1-40.

Hatch, Evelyn and Asako Yoshitomi (1993). Cognitive Processes in Language Learning. In A. Omaggio Hadley (ed.), pp 66-95.

Hatch, Evelyn, Vanessa Flashner and Larry Hunt (1986). The Experience Model and Language Teaching. In Day et al., pp. 22.

Hendrickson, James M. (1991). On Communicative Language Teaching. Hispania (74)2:197-198.

----- (1992). Teaching for Communicative Proficiency. Hispania (75)1:201-206.

de Hérédia, Christine (1986). Asymmetric Communication in Bilingual Exchanges. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 8:369-389.

Herschenschon, Julia (1990). Toward a Theoretical Basis for Current Language Pedagogy. Modern Language Journal 74:451-458.

Hertzler, J. (1970). Laughter: A Socio-Scientific Analysis, New York: Exposition Press.

Higgs, T. V. and R. Clifford (1982). The push toward communication. In T. Higgs (ed.) Curriculum, competence and the foreign language learner, pp. 57-79. Skokie, IL: National Textbooks.

Hill, Jane (1993). Is it really "No Problema"? Junk Spanish and Anglo Racism. Proceedings from the First Symposium on Language and Society - Austin. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Hopper, Paul (1988). Emergent grammar and the A priori Grammar Constraint. In D. Tannen (ed.) Linguistics in context: connecting observation and understanding, pp. 117-134. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Horowitz, Elaine (1986). Some Language Acquisition Principles and Their Implications for Second Language Teaching. Hispania 69(3):684-689.

----- (1987). Linguistic and Communicative Competence: Reassessing Foreign Language Aptitude. In VanPatten, Dvorak and Lee (eds.), pp. 146-157.

-----, Barbara Bresslaum, Marianne Dryden, Mary Elizabeth McLendon and Jyu-Fang Yu (1997). A Graduate Course Focussing on the Second Language Learner. Modern Language Journal (81)4:518-526.

Hymes, Dell (1972). On Communicative Competence. In J. Pride and J. Holmes (eds.). Sociolinguistics. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, pp. 269-293.

Jakobson, Roman (1980). Metalanguage as a linguistic problem. In The Framework of Language. Michigan Studies in the Humanities.

Jefferson, Gail (1972). Side sequences. In D. Sudnow (ed.), Studies in social interaction. New York: Free Press, pp. 294-338.

----- (1974). Error correction as an interactional resource. Language in Society 2:181-199.

----- (1979). A Technique for Inviting Laughter and its Subsequent Acceptance Declination. *In* G. Psathas, (ed.), 79-96.

----- (1985). An exercise in the transcription of laughter. In T.A. Van Dijk, (ed.), Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Vol. III, pp. 25-34. New York: Academic Press.

----- (1994). A note on laughter in male-female interaction. Unpublished manuscript.

----- Harvey Sacks and Emanuel Schegloff (1987). Notes on laughter in the pursuit of intimacy. In G. Button and J. Lee, (eds.), Talk and Social Organisation, pp. 152-205. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Johnson, Donna M. (1993). Classroom Oriented Research in Second-Language Learning. In A. Omaggio Hadley (ed.), pp. 1-23.

----- (1989). Enriching Task Contexts for Second Language Writing: Power through Interpersonal Roles. In Johnson and Roen (eds.), pp. 39-54.

----- and Duane H. Roen (eds.) (1989). Richness in Writing: Empowering ESL Students. London: Longman.

Johnstone, Barbara (ed.) (1987). Perspectives on Repetition. Special issue of Text, (7)3.

----- (1994a). Repetition in Discourse: Interdisciplinary Perspectives, Volume I. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

----- (1994b). Repetition in Discourse: Interdisciplinary Perspectives, Volume 2. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Kasper, Gabriele and Shoshana Blum-Kulka (eds.) (1993). Interlanguage Pragmatics. Oxford: University Press.

Kasper, Gabriele and Merrill Dahl (1991). Research Methods in Interlanguage Pragmatics. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 13:215-247.

Kedar, Leah (ed.) (1987). Power Through Discourse. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Kellerman, E. (1979). Transfer and non-transfer: where are we now? Studies in Second Language acquisition 2:37-57.

----- (1991). Compensatory strategies in second language research: A critique, a revision and some (non-)linguistic implications for the classroom. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood-Smith and M. Swain (eds.) Foreign/second language pedagogy research: A commemorative volume for Claus Faerch, pp. 142-161. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Khanji, Rajai (1996). Two perspectives in analyzing communication strategies. International Review of Applied Linguistics (XXXIV)2:144-154.

Klee, Carol (1998). Communication as an Organizing Principle in the National Standards: Sociolinguistic Aspects of Spanish Language Teaching. Hispania (81)2: 339-351.

Knox, Laurie (1994). Repetition and Relevance: Self-Repetition as a Strategy for Initiating Cooperation in Nonnative/Native Speaker Conversation. In B. Johnstone (ed.), Vol. I, pp. 195-207. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Kowal, Maria and Merrill Swain (1994). Using Collaborative Language Production Tasks to Promote Students' Language Awareness. Language Awareness (3)2:73-93.

Kramarae, Cheris, Muriel Schulz and William O'Barr (eds.) (1984) Language and Power. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Kramarae, Cheris, Muriel Schulz and William O'Barr (1984a). In Kramarae, Schulz and O'Barr (eds.), pp. 9-22.

Kramsch, Claire (1994). In Another Tongue. Profession, pp. 11-14.

----- (1997). The Privilege of the Nonnative Speaker. PMLA (112)3:359-369.

----- and Sally McConnell-Ginet (1992). Text and Context: Cross-Disciplinary Perspective on Language Study, Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Kranhke, Karl J. (1985). Review of The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly* 19:591-603.

Krashen, Stephen (1980). The input hypothesis. In J. Alatis (ed.) Current issues in bilingual education, pp. 168-180. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

----- (1981). Second language acquisition and second language learning. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

----- (1982). Principles and Practices in Second Language Acquisition. New York: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, Stephen (1985). The input hypothesis: Issues and implications. London: Longman.

----- and Tracy Terrell (1983). The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom. New York: Pergamon.

Labarca, Angela and Leslie M. Bailey (1990). Proceedings from the 7th Delaware Symposium on Language Studies, 1985. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Labov, William and David Fanshel (1977). Therapeutic Discourse. New York: Academic Press.

Lafayette, Robert C. (1988). Integrating the teaching of culture into the FL classroom. In A. Singerman (ed.) Toward a new integration of language and culture, pp. 47-62. Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference.

----- (1998). Culture in Second Language Learning and Teaching: Anthropology Revisited. In Lange *et al.* (eds.), pp. 109-124.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson (1980) Metaphors we live by. Chicago: University Press.

Lakoff, Robin (1990). Talking Power. New York: Basic Books.

Langacker, Ronald (1987). Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Volume 1. Stanford: University Press.

----- (1995). Viewing in Cognition and Grammar. In P. Davis (ed.), pp. 45-76.

Lange, Dale L., Carol A. Klee, R. Michael Paige and Yelena A. Yershova (1998). Culture as the Core: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Culture Teaching and Learning in the Second Language Classroom. CARLA Working Papers. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

Lantolf, James P. and Mohammed K. Ahmed (1989). Psycholinguistic Perspectives on interlanguage variation: A Vygotskyan analysis. In Gass *et al.* (eds.), Vol. II, pp. 93-108.

Lantolf, James and Gabriele Appel (eds.) (1988). Vygotskyan Approaches to Second Language Acquisition. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

----- (1994). Vygotskyan Approached to Second Language Research. Norwood, NJ; Ablex.

Lantolf, James and F. DiCamila (1983). L2 Discourse: a Vygotskyan perspective. Paper presented at *TESOL* Convention, Toronto.

Lantolf, James P. and William Frawley (1983). Second Language Performance and Vygotskyan Psycholinguistics: Implication for L2 Instruction. In Proceedings of the 10th LACUS Forum, pp. 425-440. Columbia, SC: Hornbeam Press.

Lantolf, James P. and William Frawley (1985). On communication strategies: a functional perspective. Rassegna italiana di linguistica applicata (17)2-3:143-158.

Lantolf, James and Angela LaBarca, eds. (1987). Research in Second Language Learning: Focus on the Classroom - Proceedings of the 5th Delaware Symposium on Language Studies - 1984, Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane (1980). Discourse Analysis in Second Language Research. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

----- (1995). On the Teaching and Learning of Grammar: Challenging the Myths. In Eckman et al. (eds.), pp. 131-150.

----- and Michael H. Long (1991). An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research. London: Longman.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane and Marianne Celce-Murcia (1992). A nonhierarchical relationship between grammar and communication. In J. Alatis (ed.), pp. 159-173.

Lerner, Gene H. (1987). Collaborative turn sequences: sentence construction and social interaction. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Irvine.

----- (1991). On the syntax of sentences-in-progress. Language in Society 20:441-458.

----- (1996). On the semi-permeable character of grammatical units in conversation: conditional entry unto the turn space of another speaker. In Ochs, Schegloff and Thompson (eds.), pp 238-276.

Levine, Glenn (1997). The logical problem of the 'native speaker' in bilingual language situations. Paper presented at LASSO Conference, Los Angeles, CA.

Levinson, Stephen C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge: University Press.

Lightbown Patsy and Nina Spada (1990). Focus-on-form and Corrective Feedback in Communicative Language Teaching: Effects on Second Language Learning. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 12:429-448.

Long, Michael H. (1980). Input, Interaction and Second Language Acquisition. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

----- (1981). Input, interaction, and second language acquisition. In H. Winitz (ed.) Native Language and Foreign Language Acquisition. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences. 379:259-278.

----- (1983). Linguistic and Conversational Adjustments to Non-Native Speakers. Studies in Second Language Acquisition (5)2:177-193.

----- (1989). Task, group and task-group interactions. University of Hawai'i Working Papers in ESL 8:1-26.

----- (1995). The Role of the Linguistic Environment in Second Language Acquisition. In W. Ritchie and T. Bhatia (eds). Handbook of Language Acquisition, Volume 2: Second Language Acquisition. New York: Academic Press.

Loschky, Lester and Robert Bley-Vroman (1990). Creating Structure-Based Communication Tasks for Second Language Development. University of Hawai'i Working Papers in ESL (9)1:161-212.

Lozanov, G. (1978). Suggestology and Outlines of Suggestopedy. New York: Gordon and Breach.

Luria, Alexander R. (1981). Language and Cognition. New York: Wiley.

Macionis, J. J. (1989). Sociology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Mao, LuMing Robert (1994). Beyond politeness theory: "Face' revisited and renewed. Journal of Pragmatics 21:451-486.

McDermott, R. P. and Henry Tylbor (1987). On the Necessity of Collusion in Conversation. In L. Kedar (ed.), pp. 153-170.

McGroarty, M. (1993). Cooperative learning and second language acquisition. In D. Holt (ed.) Cooperative learning, pp. 19-46. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

McIntyre, Peter, Richard Clément, Zoltán Dörnyei and Kimberly Noels (1998). Conceptualizing Willingness to Communicate in a L2: A Situational Model of L2 Confidence and Affiliation. MLJ (82)4:545-562.

Martínez-Baztán, Alfonso (1998). Comprensión auditiva y negociación de significados. Hispania 81:603-605.

Melles, Gavin (1997). Enfocando la competencia lingüística: concienciación gramatical. Hispania (80)4:848-858.

Merritt, Marilyn (1974). The Playback: An Instance of Variation in Discourse. In R. Fasold and R. Shuy (eds.), Studies in Language Variation, pp. 198-208. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

----- (1976). On questions following questions in service encounters. Language in Society 5:315-357.

----- (1984). On the Use of "OK" in Service Encounters. In Baugh and Sherzer (eds.), pp. 139-147.

----- (1994). Repetition in Situated Discourse. In B. Johnstone (ed.), Volume 1: pp. 23-26.

Mey, Jacob L. (1993). Pragmatics. Oxford: Blackwell.

Meyer, Lois (1990). It Was No Trouble: Achieving Communicative Competence in a Second Language . In Scarcella et al. (eds.), pp. 195-215.

Moerman, Michael. (1988). Talking Culture. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Moll, Luis C. (1989). Teaching Second Language Students: A Vygotskyan Perspective. In Johnson and Roen (eds.), pp. 55-69.

Ng, Sik Hung (ed.) (1995). Power of Language and Power Behind Language. Journal of Language and Social Psychology (14)4:347-350.

---- and James J. Bradac (1993). Power in Language. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Nichols, Patricia C. (1984). Network and Hierarchies - Language and Social Stratification. In Kramarae, Schulz and O'Barr (eds), pp. 23-42.

Nofsinger, Robert (1991). Everyday Conversation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Norrick, Neal (1989). Joking repair and the organization of repair in conversation. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of LSA, Washington, DC.

----- (1993). Conversational Joking. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

----- (1994). Repetition as a Conversational Joking Strategy. In B. Johnstone, (ed.) Repetition in Discourse, Volume II, pp. 15-28.

Nunan, David (1989). Designing tasks for the communicative classroom. Cambridge: University Press.

Nyikos, Martha and Reiko Hashimoto (1997). Constructivist Theory Applied to Collaborative Learning in Teacher Education: In Search of ZPD. Modern Language Journal (81)4:506-517.

O'Donnell-Trujillo, Nick and Katherine Adams (1983). *Heheh* in Conversation: Some Coordinating Accomplishments of Laughter. Western Journal of Speech Communication 47:175-91.

O'Malley, J. and A. Chamot (1990). Learning Strategies in SLA. Cambridge: University Press.

Ochs, Elinor (1975). Making it last: Uses of repetition in child language. Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistic Society 1:279-294.

----- Emanuel Schegloff and Sandra A. Thompson (eds.) (1996). Interaction and Grammar. Cambridge: University Press.

Odell, S. J. (1987). The Powers of Language: A Philosophical Analysis. In L. Kedar (ed.), pp. 19-42.

Olsen, R. E. W-B. and Kagan, S. (1992). About cooperative learning. In C. Kessler (ed.) Cooperative language learning: a teacher's resource book, pp. 1-30. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Omaggio, Alice (1983). Methodology in Transition: The New Focus on Proficiency. Modern Language Journal(67)4:330-341.

Omaggio-Hadley, Alice (ed.) (1993b). Research in Language Learning: Principles, Processes and Prospects. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Ono, Tsuyoshi and Sandra A. Thompson (1995a). What can conversation tell us about syntax? In P. Davis (ed.), pp. 213-272.

----- (1995b). Interaction and syntax in the structure of conversational discourse. In Eduard Huoy and Donia Scott (eds.) Discourse processing: an interdisciplinary perspective. Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.

Oxford, Rebecca (1997). Cooperative Learning, Collaborative Learning, and Interaction: Three Communicative Strands in the Language Classroom. Modern Language Journal (81)4:443-456.

----- and Martha Nyikos (1997). Interaction, Collaboration and Cooperation: Learning Languages and Preparing Language Teachers (Introduction to the Special Issue) Modern Language Journal (81)4:440-442.

Paikeday, T. M. (1985). The Native Speaker is Dead! Toronto/NY: Paikeday.

Pan, Yuling (1995). Power Behind Linguistic Behavior: Analysis of Politeness Phenomena in Chinese Official Settings. In S. Ng (ed.), pp.462-481.

Paribakht, T. (1985). Strategic Competence and Language Proficiency. Applied Linguistics 6:132-146.

----- (1986). On the pedagogical relevance of strategic competence. TESL Canadian Journal 3:53-66.

Pellicer, Dora (1990). Analysis of Cooperation in a Spanish NS-NNS Interview Situation. In A. Labarca and L. Bailey (eds.), pp. 192-203.

Penman, Robyn (1987). Discourse in Courts: Cooperation, Coercion and Coherence. Discourse Processes 10:201-218.

----- (1990). Facework and Politeness: Multiple Goals in Courtroom Discourse. Journal of Language and Social Psychology (9)1-2:15-38.

Philips, Susan U. (1992). The routinization of repair in courtroom discourse. In Duranti and Goodwin (eds.), pp. 312-326.

Piaget, J. (1929). The child's conception of the world. London: Kegan Paul.

Pica, Teresa (1986). Second Language Learning Through Interaction: Multiple Perspectives. Working Papers in Educational Linguistics 12(1):1-33.

----- (1987). Second-Language Acquisition, Social Interaction, and the Classroom. Applied Linguistics (8)1:3-21.

----- (1992a). Second language acquisition, social interaction and the classroom. Applied Linguistics (8)1:3-21.

----- (1992b). The Textual Outcome of Native Speaker-Nonnative Speaker Negotiation. What Do They Reveal About Second Language Learning? In Kramsch and McConnell-Ginet (eds.), pp. 198-237.

----- (1992c). Communication with second language learners: What does it reveal about the social and linguistic processes of second language learning? In J. Alatis (ed.), pp. 435-464.

----- (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal? Language Learning (44)3:493-527.

----- (1996). Do L2 Learners Need Negotiation? International Review of Applied Linguistics (34)1:1-21.

-----, Richard Young and Catherine Doughty (1987). The Impact of Interaction on Comprehension. TESOL Quarterly 21(4):737-758.

Pica, Teresa, Catherine Doughty and Richard Young (1986). The Impact of Interaction on Second Language Comprehension. Paper presented at 20th Annual TESOL Conference, Anaheim, CA., March 1986.

Pica, Teresa, Lloyd Holliday, Nora Lewis and L. Morgenthaler (1989). Comprehensible output as an outcome of linguistic demands on the learner. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 11:63-96.

Pinker, Steven (1995). The Language Instinct. New York: Harper Perennial.

Plummer, Evelyn J. (1991). We're not laughing at you, we're laughing *with* you: An examination of interactive laughter in five small group conversations. Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College.

Porter, Patricia (1986). How learners talk to each other: Input and interaction in task-centered discussion. In R. Day, (ed.), pp. 200-224.

Preston, Dennis (1989). Sociolinguistics and Second Language Acquisition. NY: Blackwell.

Provine, Robert R. (1996). Laughter. American Scientist 84:38-45.

Psathas, George (ed.) (1979). Everyday Language: studies in ethnomethodology. New York: Irvington.

Ramírez, Arnulfo G. (1995). Creating Context for Second Language Acquisition. London: Longman.

Rampton, M. B. H. (1990a). Displacing the 'native speaker': expertise, affiliation and inheritance. ELT Journal 44:2.97-101.

----- (1990b). Communication strategies revisited: General survey and commentary. Paper presented at the 9th AILA World Congress, Thessaloniki, Greece.

Richards, Jack C. and Richard W. Schmidt, eds. (1983a). Language and Communication. London: Longman.

----- (1983b). Conversational Analysis. In Richards and Schmidt (eds.), pp. 117-154.

Richards, Jack C. and Mayuri Sukwiwat (1983). Language Transfer and Conversational Competence. Applied Linguistics (4)2:113-125.

Richards, Jack C. and John Platt and Heidi Platt (1992). Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics. London: Longman.

Rivers, Wilga M. (1983). Communicating Naturally in a Second Language: Theory and Practice in Language Teaching. Cambridge: University Press.

----- (ed.) (1987). Interactive Language Teaching. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

----- (1987). Interaction as the key to teaching language for communication. In W. Rivers (ed.), pp. 3-16.

Rost, Michael and Steven Ross (1991). Learner use of strategies in interaction: Typology and teachability. Language Learning 41:235-278.

Rubin, J. and I. Thompson (1982). How to Be a More Successful Language Learner. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Rutherford, William (1987). Second Language Grammar: Learning and Teaching. London: Longman.

----- and Michael Sharwood-Smith (1985). Consciousness-raising and Universal Grammar. Applied Linguistics 6:274-282.

----- (eds.) (1988). Grammar and Second Language Teaching: A Book of Readings. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Ryan, E. B. and Howard Giles (eds.) (1982). Attitudes towards language variation: Social and applied contexts. London: Edward Arnold.

Sacks, Harvey (1992). Lectures on Conversation, Volumes I and II. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

----- and Emanuel Schegloff (1979). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversations and their interaction. In G. Psathas (ed.), pp. 15-21.

----- and Gail Jefferson (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. Language 50:696-735.

Salamone, Ann Masters and Florence Marsal (1997). How to Avoid Language Breakdown? Circumlocution! Foreign Language Annals (30)4:473-484.

Sanders, Barry (1995). Sudden glory. Boston: Beacon Press.

Sato, Charlene (1985). The Syntax of Conversation in Interlanguage Development. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

----- (1986). Conversation and Interlanguage: Rethinking the Connection. In Day et al. (eds.), pp. 23-45.

Savignon, Sandra (1990). Communicative language teaching: Definitions and directions. In J. Alatis (ed.), pp. 207-217.

----- (1997). Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Saz, Sara M. (1996). Strategies for Learning Spanish. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Scarcella, Robin, Elaine Andersen and Stephen Krashen (1990). Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language. New York: Newbury House.

Schachter, Jacqueline (1990). Communicative competence revisited. In The Development of Second Language Proficiency, ed. by B. Harley et al., 39-49. Cambridge: University Press.

Schegloff, Emanuel (1979). The Relevance of Repair to Syntax-for-Conversation. In T. Givón (ed.) Syntax and Semantics: Discourse and Syntax, pp. 261-286. New York: Academic Press.

----- (1982). Discourse as an Interactional Achievement: Some Uses of 'Uh Huh' and Other Things That Come Between Sentences. In D. Tannen (ed.) Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics, pp. 71-93. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

----- (1996). Turn organization: one intersection of grammar and interaction. In Ochs, Schegloff and Thompson (eds.), pp. 52-133.

----- and Harvey Sacks (1973). Opening up closings. Semiotica 7:289-327.

Schegloff, Emanuel, Gail Jefferson and Harvey Sacks (1977). The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation. Language 53:361-382.

Schenkein, James N. (1972). Towards an Analysis of Conversation and the Sense of *heheh*. Semiotica 6:344-377.

Schiffrin, Deborah (1987a). Discourse Markers.

----- (1987b). Towards an empirical basis in pragmatics..

----- (1994). Approaches to Discourse. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schinke-Llano, Linda (1993). On the Value of a Vygotskian Framework for SLA Theory and Research. Language Learning (43)1:121-129.

----- (1995). Reenvisioning the Second Language Classroom: A Vygotskian Approach. In Eckman et al. (eds.), pp. 21-28.

Schmidt, Richard W. (1990). The Role of Consciousness in Second Language Learning. Applied Linguistics (11)2:129-158.

Schultz, Emily A. (1990). Dialogue in the Margins: Whorf, Bakhtin and Linguistic Relativity. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Schwartz, Joan (1980). The Negotiation for Meaning: Repair in Conversations between Second Language Learners of English. In Larsen-Freeman (ed.), pp. 138-153.

Scollon, Ron and Suzanne B. K. Scollon (1983). Face in interethnic communication. In J. Richards and R. Schmidt (eds.), pp. 156-188.

----- (1995). Intercultural communication: a discourse approach. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Searle, John R. (1969). Speeh Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge: University Press.

Seliger, Herbert (1983). Learner Interaction in the Classroom and Its Effects on Language Acquisition. In H. Seliger and M. Long (eds.), Classroom-Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition, pp. 246-266. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Selinker, Larry (1972). Interlanguage. International Review of Applied Linguistics 10:209-230.

Sharwood-Smith, Michael (1988). Consciousness-raising and the second language learner. In Rutherford and Sharwood-Smith (eds.) Grammar and Second Language Teaching. New York: Newbury House.

Shotter, John (1993). Conversational Realities: Constructing Life Through Language. London: Sage.

Shuy, Roger W. (1987). Conversational Power in FBI Covert Tape Recordings. In L. Kedar (ed.), pp. 43-56.

Slobin, Dan (1982). Universal and particular in the acquisition of language. In E. Wanner and L. Gleitman (eds.) Language Acquisition: The State of the Art. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 128-170.

Stewart, Stuart (1995). The Multiple Functions of Laughter in a Dominican Spanish Conversation. Paper presented at Language South of the Río Bravo Conference, New Orleans, LA.

----- (1996a). Negotiating Troubled Turns in NS/NNS Spanish Discourse. Paper presented at LSU Conference on Languages and Literature, Baton Rouge, LA.

----- (1996b). The Power Differential in Native/ Non-Native Discourse. Paper presented at SECOL Meeting, College Station, Texas.

----- (1997a). The Many Faces of Conversational Laughter. Paper presented at Languaging: Conference on Linguistics and Literature, Denton, Texas.

----- (1997b). Increasing Strategic Competence: Accessing The Zone of Proximal Development in Second Language Interactions. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest, Los Angeles, CA.

----- (1998). It's no laughing matter: Analysis of Laughter by Native and Non-native Speakers in a Dominican Spanish Conversation. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest, Phoenix, AZ.

----- and Lynn Pearson (1995). Development of Communication Strategies Among Foreign Language Learners. MIFLC Review: Selected Proceedings of the Mountain Interstate Foreign Language Conference, Volume V, pp. 112-127.

Stubbs, Michael (1983). Discourse Analysis. Chicago: University Press.

Swaffar, Janet and Susan Bacon (1993). Reading and Listening Comprehension: Perspectives on Research and Implications for Practice. In A. Omaggio Hadley (ed.), pp. 124-155.

Swain, Merrill (1984). Large Scale Communicative Language Testing. In S. Savignon and H. Berns (eds.), pps. ??

----- (1985). Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass and C. Madden (eds), pp. 235-253.

Swain, Merrill and S. Lapkin (1998). Interaction and second language learning. Modern Language Journal (82)3:320-337.

Takahashi, Etsuko. (1998). Language development in social interaction: A Longitudinal Study of a Japanese FLES Program from a Vygotskyan Approach. Foreign Language Annals (31)3:392-406.

Tannen, Deborah (1984). Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk Among Friends. Norwod, NJ:Ablex.

----- (1987a). Remarks on Discourse and Power. In L. Kedar (ed.), pp. 3-10.

----- (1987b). Repetition in conversation: Toward a poetics of talk. Language (63)3:574-605.

----- (1987c). Repetition in conversation as spontaneous formulaicity. In B. Johnstone (ed.), pp. 225-240.

----- (1989). Talking voices: repetition, dialogue and imagery in conversational discourse. Cambridge: University Press.

----- (1993). Framing in Discourse. Oxford: University Press.

Tarone, Elaine (1978). Conscious Communication Strategies in Interlanguage: A Progress Report. In H. Brown, C. Yorio and D. Crymes, (eds.) On Tesol 77: Teaching and Learning in ESL, pp. 194-203. Washington, DC: TESOL.

----- (1980). Communication Strategies, Foreigner Talk and Repair in Interlanguage. Language Learning 30:417-431.

----- (1981). Some Thoughts on the Notion of Communication Strategy. TESOL Quarterly 15:285-295.

----- (1984). Teaching strategic competence in the foreign-language classroom. In S. Savignon and M. Berns (eds.), pp. 127-136.

----- (1989). Accounting for style-shifting in interlanguage. In Gass et al. (eds.), Vol. I, pp. 13-21.

----- and George Yule (1989). Focus on the Language Learner. Oxford: University Press.

Taylor, D. (1988). The meaning and use of the term 'competence' in linguistics and applied linguistics. Applied Linguistics (9)2:148-168.

Terrell, Tracy (1991). The Role of Grammar Instruction in a Communicative Approach. Modern Language Journal 75:52-63.

-----, Magdalena Andrade, Jeanne Egasse and Elías Miguel Muñoz (1994). Dos Mundos. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Thimm, Caja, Ute Rademacher and Lenelis Kruse (1995). "Power-Related Talk": Control in Verbal Interaction. In S. Ng (ed.), pp. 382-407.

Thomas, Jenny (1983). Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure. Applied Linguistics (4)2:91-112.

Todorov, Tzvetan (1984). Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogical Principle. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Tomlin, Russell S. (1994). Repetition in Second Language Acquisition. In B. Johnstone (ed.), Vol. I:172-194.

Treichler, Paula A., R. Frankel, C. Kramarae, K. Zoppi and H. Beckman (1984). Problems and *Prob*lems - Power Relationships in a Medical Encounter. In Kramarae, Schulz and O'Barr (eds.), pp. 62-88.

van Dijk, T. A. (1981). Review of R.O. Freedle (ed.) 1979. Journal of Linguistics 17:140-148.

VanPatten, Bill (1998). Perceptions of and Perseptives on the Term "Communicative" Hispania 81:925-932.

-----, James F. Lee and Terry L. Ballman (2000). *¿Sabías que...?* Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

VanPatten, Bill, Martha Alford Marks and Richard V. Teschner (1997). Destinos. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

VanPatten, Bill Trisha R. Dvorak and James F. Lee (eds.) (1987). Foreign Language Learning: A Research Perspective. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Váradi, T. (1973). Strategies of target language learner communication: Message adjustment. Paper presented at the 6th Conference of the Rumanian-English Linguistics Project. Published in IRAL 18:59-71, 1980.

Varonis, Evangeline Marlos and Susan M. Gass (1983). Native/nonnative conversations: a model for the negotiation of meaning. Applied Linguistics 6:71-90.

----- (1985). Miscommunication in Native/Nonnative Conversation. Language in Society 14:327-343.

Vasseur, Maria Thèrése Vasseur, Peter Broeder and Cecilia Roberts (1996). In Bremer et al (eds.), pp. 65-108.

Vološinov, V. N. (1926). Discourse in Life and Discourse in Art (Concerning Sociological Poetics). In I. Titunik and N. Bruss (eds.), Freudianism, pp. 93-116. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.

----- (1973). Verbal Interaction. In Marxism and the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1934). *Myshlenie i rech'* [Thinking and speech. Moscow: Sorsekriz. (English translation Thought and Language. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1962).

----- (1978). Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

----- (1986). Thought and Language. Cambridge: University Press.

Wagner-Gough, K. and E. Hatch (1975). The importance of input in second language acquisition studies. Language Learning 25:297-308.

Wardhaugh, Ronald (1992). An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wertsch, James V. (1981). The Concept of Activity in Soviet Psychology. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe

----- (1985). Vygotsky and the Social Formation of Mind. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

White, Lydia (1987). Against comprehensible input: The input hypothesis and the development of second language competence. Applied Linguistics 8:95-110.

Wilhelm, Kim Hughes (1997). Sometimes Kicking and Screaming: Language Teachers-in Training React to a Collaborative Learning Model. Modern Language Journal (81)4:527-543.

Willis, R. H. (1965). The basic response modes of conformity, independence and anti-conformity. Human Relations 18:373-88.

Wing, Barbara H. (1987). The Linguistic and Communicative Functions of Foreign Language Teacher Talk. In VanPatten, Dvorak and Lee (eds.), pp. 158-173.

Woken, Miles and John Swales (1989). Expertise and Authority in Native-Non-native Conversations: The Need for a Variable Account. In Gass *et al.* (eds.), Vol. I, pp. 211-227.

Wolfson, Nessa (1986). The bulge: A theory of speech behavior and social distance. Working Papers in Educational Linguistics (2)1:55-83.

----- (1989). Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

----- and Elliot Judd (eds.) (1983). Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Young, Richard and Catherine Doughty (1987). Negotiation in Context: A Review of Research. In Lantolf and LaBarca (eds.), pp. 213-224. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Yule, George (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford: University Press.

----- (1997). Referential Communication Tasks. Mahawah, NJ: Erlbaum.

----- and Elaine Tarone (1990). Eliciting the Performance of Strategic Competence. In Scarcella, Andersen and Krashen (eds.), pp. 179-194.

Yule, George and Maggie Powers (1994). Investigating the Communicative Outcomes of Task-Based Interaction. System 22:81-91.

Zayas-Bayán, Eduardo, Susan M. Bacon and José B. Fernández (1997). ¡Arriba! Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Zuengler, Jane (1982). Applying accommodation theory to variable performance data in L2. SSLA 4:181-192.

----- (1987). Effects of expertise; in interactions between native and non-native speakers. Language and Communication 7:123-137.

Zuengler, Jane (1989). Performance Variation in NS-NNS Interactions: Ethnolinguistic Difference or Discourse Domain? In Gass *et al*. (eds.), pp. 228-244,

----- (1991). Accommodation in native-nonnative interactions: going beyond the "what" to the "why" in second language research. In Giles, Coupland and Coupland (eds.), pp. 223-244.

----- (1993). Explaining NNS Interactional Behavior: The Effect of Conversational Topic. In G. Kasper and S. Blum-Kulka (eds.), pp. 184-195.

----- (in press). Encouraging Learners' Conversational Participation: The Effect of Content Knowledge. Language Learning (43)3:403-432.

APPENDIX A

CONSENT FORM

I participated voluntarily in this project. Although the results will be used for scholarly research, my identity will not be divulged.

Signed _____

Thanks for your help!

APPENDIX B

TASK INSTRUCTIONS

Stylist

You are a hair stylist. A customer comes in to make an appointment. Check your schedule to see if you have an opening (at least one hour).

9:00 ----------

9:30 ----------

10:00 -------Appointments----------

10:30 -------Appointments----------

11:00 -------Appointments----------

11:30 -------Appointments----------

12:00 ----------

12:30 ----------

1:00 -------Lunch----------

1:30 -------Lunch----------

2:00 ----------

2:30 -------Appointments----------

3:00 -------Appointments----------

3:30 ----------

4:00 -------Appointments----------

4:30 -------Appointments----------

5:00 ----------

Cliente

Usted necesita cortarse el pelo. Después del trabajo, va a una peluquería para fijar una cita. Abajo está su horario del próximo día. Fije una cita (por una hora a lo menos) cuando puede cortarse el pelo. Es muy importante que se corte el pelo en este día porque va a salir después de mañana en un viaje de negocios.

9:00 -------Trabajo----------

9:30 -------Trabajo----------

10:00 -------Trabajo----------

10:30 -------Trabajo----------

11:00 -------Trabajo----------

11:30 ----------

12:00 -------Almuerzo con mejor amigo/a----------

12:30 -------que va a pasar por la ciudad----------

1:00 -------y ésta es su único tiempo libre----------

1:30 -------Trabajo----------

2:00 -------Reunión con el jefe----------

2:30 -------Reunión con el jefe----------

3:00 ----------

3:30 ----------

4:00 -------Cita con el doctor----------

4:30 -------de la compañía----------

5:00 ----------

APPENDIX C

ACTFL GUIDELINES

ACTFL Guidelines for Speaking

Novice

The Novice level is characterized by the ability to communicate minimally with learned material.

Novice-Low (N-L)

Oral production consists of isolated words and perhaps a few high-frequency phrases. Essentially no functional communicative ability.

Novice-Mid (N-M)

Oral production continues to consist of isolated words and learned phrases within very predictable areas of need, although quantity is increased. Vocabulary is sufficient only for handling simple, elementary needs and expressing basic courtesies. Utterances rarely consist of more than two or three words and show frequent long pauses and repetition of interlocutor's words. Speaker may have some difficulty producing even the simplest utterances. Some N-M speakers will be understood only with great difficulty.

Novice-High (N-H)

Able to satisfy partially the requirements of basic communicative exchange by relying heavily on learned utterances by occasionally expanding these through simple recombinations of their elements. Can ask questions or

make statements involving learned material. Shows signs of spontaneity although this falls short of real autonomy of expression. Speech continues to consist of learned utterances rather than of personalized, situationally adapted ones. Vocabulary centers on areas such as basic objects, places, and most common kinship terms. Pronunciation may still be strongly influenced by first language. Errors are frequent and, in spite of repetition, some N-H speakers will have difficulty being understood even by sympathetic interlocutors.

Intermediate

The Intermediate level is characterized by the speaker's ability to 1) create with the language by combining and recombining learned elements, though primarily in the reactive mode; 2) initiate, minimally sustain, and close in a simple way basic communicative tasks and 3) ask and answer questions.

Intermediate-Low (I-L)

Able to handle successfully a limited number of interactive, task-oriented and social situations. Can ask and answer questions, initiate and respond to simple statements and maintain face-to-face conversation, although in a highly restricted manner and with much linguistic inaccuracy. Within these limitations, can perform such tasks as introducing self, ordering a meal, asking directions, and making purchases. Vocabulary is adequate

to express only the most elementary needs. Strong interference from native language may occur. Misunderstandings frequently arise, but with repetition, the I-L speaker can generally be understood by sympathetic interlocutors.

Advanced

The Advanced level is characterized by the speaker's ability to 1) converse in a clearly participatory fashion; 2) initiate, sustain and bring to a closure a wide variety of communicative tasks including those that require an increased ability to convey meaning with diverse language strategies due to a complication or an unforeseen turn of events; 3) satisfy the requirements of school and work situations; and 4) narrate and describe with paragraph-length connected discourse.

Advanced-Plus (A-P)

Able to satisfy the requirements of a broad variety of everyday, school, and work situations. Can discuss concrete topics relating to particular interests and special fields of competence. There is emerging evidence of ability to support opinions, explain in detail and hypothesize. The A-P speaker often shows a well-developed ability to compensate for an imperfect grasp of some forms with confident use of communicative strategies, such as paraphrasing and circumlocution. Differentiated vocabulary and intonation are effectively used to communicate fine

shades of meaning. The S-P speaker often shows remarkable fluency and ease of speech, but under the demands of Superior-level, complex tasks, language may break down or prove inadequate.

Superior

The Superior level is characterized by the speaker's ability to: 1) participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, professional, and abstract topics; 2) support opinions and hypothesize using native-like discourse strategies.

Superior (S)

Able to speak the language with sufficient accuracy to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, professional and abstract topics. Can discuss special fields of competence and interest with ease. Can support opinions and hypothesize, but may not be able to tailor language to audience or discuss in depth highly abstract or unfamiliar topics. Usually the S level speaker is only partially familiar with regional or other dialectical variants. The S speaker commands a wide variety of interactive strategies and shows good awareness of discourse strategies. The latter involves the ability to distinguish main ideas from supporting information through syntactic, lexical and suprasegmental features (pitch, stress, intonation). Sporadic errors may occur, particularly in low-frequency

structures and some complex high-frequency structures more common to formal writing, but no patterns of error are evident. Errors do not disturb the NS or interfere with communication.

ACTFL Guidelines for Listening

These guidelines assume that all listening tasks take place in an authentic environment at a normal rate of speech using standard or near-standard norms.

Novice

Novice-Low (N-L)

Understanding is limited to occasional isolated words, such as cognates, borrowed words, and high-frequency social conventions. Essentially no ability to comprehend even short utterances.

Novice-Mid (N-M)

Able to understand some short, learned utterances, particularly where context strongly supports understanding and speech is clearly audible. Comprehends some words and phrases from simple questions, statements, high-frequency commands and courtesy formulae about topics that refer to basic personal information or the immediate physical setting. The listener requires long pauses for assimilation and periodically requests repetition and/or a slower rate of speech.

Novice-High (N-H)

Able to understand short, learned utterances and some sentence-length utterances, particularly where context strongly supports understanding and speech is clearly audible. Comprehends words and phrases from simple questions, statements, high-frequency commands and courtesy formulae. May require repetition, rephrasing and/or a slowed rate of speech for comprehension.

Intermediate

Intermediate-Low (I-L)

Able to understand sentence-length utterances which consist of recombinations of learned elements in a limited number of content areas, particularly if strongly supported by the situational context. Content refers to basic personal background and needs, social conventions and routine tasks, such as getting meals and receiving simple instructions and directions. Listening tasks pertain primarily to spontaneous face-to-face conversations. Understanding is often uneven; repetition and rewording may be necessary. Misunderstandings in both main ideas and details arise frequently.

Advanced

Advanced-Plus (A-P)

Able to understand the main ideas of most speech in a standard dialect; however, the listener may not be able to sustain extended comprehension in extended discourse which

is propositionally and linguistically complex. Listener shows an emerging awareness of culturally implied meanings beyond the surface meanings of the test but may fail to grasp sociocultural nuances of the message.

Superior (S)

Able to understand the main ideas of all speech in a standard dialect, including technical discussion in a field of specialization. Can follow the essentials of extended discourse which is propositionally and linguistically complex, as in academic/professional settings, in lectures, speeches, and reports. Listener shows some appreciation of aesthetic norms of TL, of idioms, colloquialisms, and register shifting. Able to make inferences within the cultural framework of the TL. Understanding is aided by an awareness of the underlying organizational structure of the oral text and includes sensitivity for its social and cultural references and its effective overtones. Rarely misunderstands but may not understand excessively rapid, highly colloquial speech or speech that has strong cultural references.

APPENDIX D

RECAP OF RESULTS OF ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

TABLE 4. Results of Questionnaire -- Level 3

2101	J	S
1	3	5
2	2	5
3	5	4
4	5	4
5	2	4
6	5	4
7	4	3
8	1	2
9	2	3
10	5	3
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	5	5
15	1	1
16	5	5
17	1	1
18	5	5
19	5	5
20	5*	5
21	5	5

* Very enjoyable -- met a new friend!

TABLE 5. Results of Questionnaire -- Level 4

2102	C	M
1	4	4
2	1	3
3	3	5
4	2	4
5	2*	3
6	5	4
7	2*	2
8	1	2
9	2	3
10	3	4
11	2	1
12	2	1
13	4	1
14	3	4
15	3*	1
16	4	5
17	1	1
18	5	2
19	2	4
20	5*	2
21	4	5

5 Out of all the Spanish I've taken, I like 2102 the best because it does not focus strictly on grammar.
7 I enjoy speaking Spanish, but I do not feel that I am fully capable.
15 I spent 2 months in Saltillo, Mexico
20 This was fun - thank you!

APPENDIX E

TRANSCRIPTION OF DATA

Simulated Service Encounters

Situation 1a

1A - 2102/BS	NS - Male	(S)	NNS - Male	(B)
2A - 2102/MS	NS - Female	(S)	NNS - Female	(M)
3A - 2101/SC	NS - Male	(C)	NNS - Female	(S)
4A - 2101/AM	NS - Female	(A)	NNS - Male	(M)

Discourse Sample #1A

1 NS: Buenas tardes.

2 NNS: Buenas tardes. Uh,

((door opens and closes))

@@@@@@, uh:,

3 NS: ((whispered)) ¿En qué puedo servirle?

4 NNS: Um, ¿qué asisto? Uhhh,

5 NS: Necesito un corto de pelo para mañana.

6 NNS: Ok. Uh:, ¿Cuánto, uh, cuánto tiempo?

7 NS: Eh, no sé. Necesito que me lo corte bien. Entonces, no sé cuánto tiempo le lleve Ud. pero, ¿a qué hora Ud. puede darme un cor, una cita para cortarme el pelo?

8 NNS: Sí. Um, uh, ((clears throat)), um, yo tengo uh, las citas, uh:, yo, uh, yo tengo las citas por uh, diez y media a doce.

10 NS: Umhm.

11 NNS: Uh:,

12 NS: ¿A qué hora se empieza a cortar el pelo Ud.?

13 NNS: Um, ¿12:30 um, a uno? Uh, [@@@

14 NS: [No, pero, ¿A qué horas abren: en la mañana? ¿A qué horas llegan,

15 NNS: Uh, [@@@@@@@

16 NS: [en la mañana?

17 NNS: ¿Hora, @@@@@@, hora por tu [cita?

18 NS: [Yo tengo libre de ocho a nueve de la mañana. Quizás si Ud. puede cortarme el pelo a las ochco de la mañana. O ¿a qué hora abren Uds. la peluquería?

19 NNS: Um, @@@@@@@, ((deep inhalation)) uh:, okay, um, ... (2.0) pero tú corta, uh:, tu pe-, tu pelo para una hora?

20 NS: Sí.

21 NNS: Okay. Um, ¿el hora uh, para, ... (3.0) nueve a diez?

22 NS: No puedo. Tengo que trabajar. ¿Qué tal, qué tal a las 11 de la mañana?

23 NNS: Okay, um, ((clears throat)), para el corte tu pelo, um, ... (5.0)

24 NS: A las [once

25 NNS: [doc-

26 NS: puedes?

27 NNS: No, mi almuerzo en el once, en el, uh en el uno a dos and uh, yo tengo citas uh, por diez: ... (2.0) a doce.

28 NS: Ah, okay.

29 NNS: Um...uh, una hora libre uh, por doce a once?

30 NS: ¿Doce a, a once o doce a una?

31 NNS: Doce a una.

32 NS: Mmm, no, yo, yo tengo libre de 11 a 12, y después tengo, tengo que, tengo una cita con mi mejor amigo para comer "lunch."

33 NNS: ((whispered)) Ok, uh,

34 NS: Eh, y no me puede ver a ningun, a ninguna otra hora. Y luego tengo que trabajar, y luego tengo una reunión con mi jefe.

35 NNS: OK.

36 NS: Tengo libre a las tres de la tarde.

37 NNS: ¿Tres a la tarde?

38 NS: Uh huh.

39 NNS: Uh, uh, para cortar tu pelo uh, una hora, uh, una, uh, una hora 3:30 a 4.

40 NS: Eh, si acaso me lo corta de las 3:30 a 4?

41 NNS: Sí.

42 NS: Sí. Es rápido.

43 NNS: Bueno.

44 NS: Bueno. Es que yo tengo de las 3 a 4 libre.

45 NNS: Sí.

46 NS: Voy a tratar de llegar a las tres, por si estás libre, si acaso no llega tu cita anterior, para ver si de 3 a 4 me puedes cortar el pelo. Si no, de 3:30 a 4, ¿sí?

47 NNS: Sí.

48 NS: Y este, y no más a las 4 tengo que estar libre, porque tengo una cita con, con el doctor.

49 NNS: OK, um,

50 NS: Entonces, a las 3:30.

51 NNS: ¿Tres y media?

52 NS: ¿Me anotas?

53 NNS: S [í.

54 NS: [¿Me anotas?

55 NNS: Mi notas. Escribir en el, escribo, escribo en el libro.

56 NS: OK.

57 NNS: ¿S [í?

58 NS: [Sí.

59 NNS: Adi [ós.

60 NS: [Adiós.

Discourse Sample #2A

1 NNS: Hola.

2 NS: Necesito una cita.

3 NNS: Sí. ¿A qué hora necesita una cita?

4 NS: Bueno, mañana tengo el horario ocupado, pero estoy libre de once a doce y de tres a cuatro o de cinco en adelante a cualquier hora.

5 NNS: Doce es muy bueno para mí.

6 NS: Pero a las doce tengo un compromiso. A las doce no puedo. ¿De las once a las doce? ¿A las once? ¿Cómo está tu horario?

7 NNS: No.

8 NS: ¿A las tres?

9 NNS: No señorita. A tres y media ¿posiblemente?

10 NS: De tres y media, no, porque a las cuatro tengo una cita con el doctor.

11 NNS: ¿A las nueve en la mañana?

12 NS: Estoy trabajando.

13 NNS: ¿Necesitan, necesita Ud. cortar el pelo hoy?

14 NS: Mañana. Urgentemente porque tengo una, un viaje de negocios.

15 NNS: Repita, por favor.

16 NS: Tengo un viaje de negocios el próximo día. Después de mañana tengo un viaje de negocios y necesito cortarme el pelo mañana.

17 NNS: @@@@ No compre@@@@ndo. @@@@@

18 NS: @@@@ Tengo que cortarme el pelo mañana. Es urgente. @@@@ Por favor. ¿De doce a una Ud. tiene libre?

19 NNS: Posible una. Porque yo comer. Almorzar a las doce?

20 NS: Entonces yo podría estar aquí a las once.

21 NNS: Yo almorzea a las once. @@@@

22 NS: ¿Tú almuerzas a las once? ¿A las once almuerzas?

23 NNS: Sí.

24 NS: Ah, okay.

25 NNS: No, a las una.

26 NS: No, porque a la una yo trabajo. Um, ¿de tres a cuatro?

27 NNS: No, no es posiblemente.

28 NS: ¿Después de las cinco?

29 NNS: ... (4.0) No abrimos a las cinco. @@@@

30 NS: @@@@ Entonces, no sé lo que podemos hacer. Es muy urgente de verdad.

31 NNS: @@@@ Sólo tiempo libre es nueve o doce.

32 NS: ¿De once a doce no es posible? Eh, puedo venir aquí,

33 NNS: Y, no, yo tengo las citas a las diez y a las once.

34 NS: ¿No podrías hacer una excepción mañana y cortarme el pelo después de las cinco, sólo por un día?

35 NNS: Sí, señorita, por <u>muchos</u> dinero, @@@@

36 NS: ¿Mucho?

37 NNS: Sí, por mucho dinero yo esperó para Ud.

38 NS: @@@@ ¿Mucho dinero?

39 NNS: Sí.

40 NS: ¿Cuánto?

41 NNS: Uh, por veinte dólares ¿propio?

42 NS: ¿Propina, veinte dólares propina?

43 NNS: Sí, propina.

44 NS: ¿Más el corte del pelo?

45 NNS: Sí. Es muy ... (3.0)?

46 NS: ¿Cuánto sería en total? La propina más el corto de pelo, ¿cuánto sería en total?

47 NNS: No entiendo.

48 NS: Total. Todo. ¿Cuánto sería por todo? Tengo que pagarle,..

49 NNS: ¿Total cuesta?

50 NS: Um hm. ¿Cuánto me cuesta? ¿Cuánto me va a costar? Veinte dólares,

51 NNS: Sí=

52 NS: =propina ¿más, ? ¿Sólo veinte dólares?

53 NNS: Por treinta dólares en total.

54 NS: ¿Total? OK, está bien, @@@@

55 NNS: @@@@ Gracias.

56 NS: Entonces, mañana a las cinco.

57 NNS: Sí, señora.

58 NS: OK. Muchas gracias. @@@@

59 NNS: Adios. @@@@

60 NS: Adios. @@@@

Discourse Sample #3A

1 NS: Oye, ¿tienes cita libre para mañana, algún tiempo en puedo cortarme el pelo?

2 NNS: Okay. Wait, slow down.

3 NS: Quiero cortarme el pelo y tiene que ser hoy porque mañana me voy de la ciudad. So far so good?

4 NNS: No, no. Okay.

5 NS: I wanna, I wanna cut my hair.

6 NNS: Oh, okay. Um well..

7 NS: Tengo una hora libre...

8 NNS: Okay.

9 NS: A las once.

10 NNS: Okay, no.

11 NS: ¿No?

12 NNS: No, um,

13 NS: Puede ser a las tres.

14 NNS: Uh, no---, um you, um, vaya, ¿vaya?

15 NS: ¿Vaya?

16 NNS: Vaya, vaya a las, um...

17 NS: No, venga.

18 NNS: ¿Venga?

19 NS: It means come.

20 NNS: Okay. Venga a las doce.

21 NS: ¿Doce? A las doce, no puedo.

22 NNS: Venga a las nueve.

23 NS: Nueve de la mañana. Uh-uh, tengo que trabajar.

24 NNS: Okay, um, an hour?

25 NS: Sí, ¿no tienes otra hora libre a las tres?

26 NNS: No.

27 NS: ¿No? A las once.

28 NNS: A las once, um, well, that's, I'm so bad at this.

29 NS: Uh-uh.

30 NNS: A las once, no.

31 NS: ¿No once?

32 NNS: No once.

32 NS: No once, so,

33 NNS: A las doce, I have, yo tengo doce y nueve.

34 NS: Libre, libre. It means available.

35 NNS: Libre.

36 NS: Libre, um,

37 NNS: Para, wait, para un hora

38 NS: Yeah, déjame ver um. So, ¿a las doce y a las nueve? Yo trabajo de nueve a once. Entonces, voy a recorrer mi horario de trabajo.

39 NNS: Uh-huh, sí, um.

40 NS: Para poder ir contigo de nueve a diez

41 NNS: Sí.

42 NS: Y después yo trabajo de diez a doce, ¿okay?

43 NNS: Okay.

44 NS: Um,

45 NNS: Okay. So, um, split it, how do you say? I'm getting stumped.

46 NS: Okay.

47 NNS: Okay.

48 NS: Uh-huh. What were you going to say?

49 NNS: Uh, I was going to try to say, how you, we could split up an hour.

50 NS: Split up?

51 NNS: I don't know. Like when you come for thirty minutes and come back for thirty minutes.

52 NS: Ah, puede ser. Pero, ¿a qué hora? Yo tengo libre, free, de once a doce.

53 NNS: De dos, de doce,

54 NS: Uh-huh.

55 NNS: Y a nueve. Y, um, tres treinta.

56 NS: De doce. ¿A qué hora tienes libre? De doce a,

57 NNS: Doce y doce treinta y tres treinta.

58 NS: ¿Tres treinta? Bien.

59 NNS: Sí.

60 NS: Tres treinta.

61 NNS: Treinta minutos.

62 NS: Pues, ¿me puedes cortar el pelo in half an hour and then half an hour?

63 NNS: Okay.

64 NS: ¿No, no es problema?

65 NNS: No.

66 NS: Si me lo cortas,

67 NNS: Sí.

68 NS: Un lado,

69 NNS: Sí.

70 NS: En media hora,

71 NNS: Okay.

72 NS: and then I, yo me voy y luego el otro lado, la otra media hora.

73 NNS: Sí, okay.

74 NS: Me voy a ver chistoso en la calle, ¿eh?

75 NNS: ¿Cómo?

76 NS: La gente se va a reír de mí, si me ve con un lado cortado y el otro lado ... sin cortar.

77 NNS: Right. Sí.

78 NS: Mejor, mejor que nos vemos a las nueve.

79 NNS: Ah, sí.

80 NS: De nueve, de nueve a diez.

81 NNS: Sí.

82 NS: And I'm gonna, yo cambio mi horario del trabajo.

83 NNS: Okay.

84 NS: Muy bien.

85 NNS: Okay.

86 NS: ¿Sí? ¿Te parece bien?

87 NNS: Sí.

88 NS: ¿Cómo me vas a cortar? ¿Cómo ... me vas a cortar?

89 NNS: Uh-huh.

90 NS: How?

91 NNS: Oh, um, I don't know, um,

92 NS: Corto.

93 NNS: Corto.

94 NS: Pequeño.

95 NNS: Pequeño. El, la, I don't know! Um, ¿es, es así? It's okay.

96 NS: ¿El corto? ¿El horario?

97 NNS: El, um. ¿El listo?

98 NS: ¿El tiempo?

99 NNS: ¿El, um? What am I saying?

100 NS: Schedule.

101 NNS: Sí. Es okay.

102 NS: Eh,

103 NNS: So completo [e like English]

104 NS: Completo [same pron], sí, sí, sí.

105 NNS: So, vamanos. We, vamanos.

106 NS: Uh-huh.

107 NNS: Uste-, I mean, ¿nosotros vamanos?

108 NS: Uh-huh.

109 NNS: Sí, okay.

110 NS: Uh-huh.

111 NNS: Okay. So we're stopped.

Discourse Sample #4A

1 NNS: Hola señora.

2 NS: Buenas tardes. ¿Cómo está Ud.?

3 NNS: Así, bueno, bueno. ¿Y tú?

4 NS: Bien gracias.

5 NNS: Uh,

6 NS: Yo necesito hacer una cita para mañana para, uh, cortarme el pelo.

7 NNS: ¿Tu pelo?

8 NS: Sí.

9 NNS: Bien. ¿Cuánto ah, qué tiempo?

10 NS: Bueno, yo puedo, no sé si hay disponible para las once y treinta.

11 NNS: ¿Las once y treinta? Ah, no bueno. Yo tengo mucho trabajo a once y treinta.

12 NS: ¿Podría ser a las doce en la hora de mi almuerzo?

13 NNS: Almuerzo, no, yo, ah, yo come mi almuerzo, eh, once, uno hora. One o'clock, um,

14 NS: ¿Qué hora tiene Ud. disposible para mi cita?

15 NNS: Es posible nueve, nueve media.

16 NS: Ah, pero a esta hora yo estoy en mi trabajo.

17 NNS: ¿Doce, doce y media?

18 NS: Es mi almuerzo.

19 NNS: ¿Dos?

20 NS: ¿Y es posible a las tres y trienta? ¿rápido?

21 NNS: Sí, sí. Bueno, bueno tres y treinta.

22 NS: Tengo que dar mi nombre,

23 NNS: ¿Cómo? ¿Por favor?

24 NS: Ud. necesita mi nombre. Tengo que dar mi dato para la cita de mañana. Mi nombre,

25 NNS: ¿Tu nombre? Um hm. Ah, yo no tengo, ¿cómo?

26 NS: Mi nombre es A. para la cita de mañana, ¿eh?

27 NNS: Es no bueno. @@@@ Yo hablo POCO español. Yo vive en Phoenix, poco. That's all. GRRR. ¿Es posible yo corte tu pelo, eh, tres y treinto, treinta?

28 NS: Treinta.

29 NNS: ¿Es posible?

30 NS: Sí, yo tengo,

31 NNS: ¿Es bueno por tú?

32 NS: Sí, es favorable para mi horario porque tengo libre esta hora.

33 NNS: No comprendo. No comprendo.

34 NS: Si es que, es favorable para mí a las tres treinta porque esta hora tengo disponible, tengo libre para poder venir aquí a esa hora.

35 NNS: Well.

36 NS: Entonces queda confirmada a las tres treinta mi cita para mañana.

37 NNS: ¿Para mañana?

38 NS: Sí, tres treinta.

39 NNS: Tres treinta. ¿Para mañana? This is mañana? Huh?

40 NS: ¿No hay necesidad que yo llame antes por teléfono para reconfirmar? ¿No es necesario?

41 NNS: Está, no comprendo. No sé.

42 NS: Eh, ¿por la mañana, no tengo que llamar, de nuevo, para confirmar mi-, mi cita? ¿No es necesario?

43 NNS: Damn.

44 NS: No, no.

45 NNS: Okay.

46 NS: Tú díme, díme, "No, ya está comfirmada su cita para mañana."

47 NNS: ¿Yo telefone mañana? ... (3.0) ¿Por qué?

48 NS: Eh, no, no, eh, si es necesario que yo reconfirme por la mañana mi cita. Voy a quedar confirmada para esa hora.

49 NNS: Huh? @@@@

50 NS: Porque quedamos para las tres treinta, ¿no?

51 NNS: Tres treinta. Es bueno.

52 NS: El día de mañana.

53 NNS: El día de mañana.

54 NS: Ya queda confirmado.

55 NNS: Confirm?

56 NS: Confirmado. Si no hay necesidad que yo llame mañana.

57 NNS: I'm stuck on this part. I don't know what's she saying! @@@@@@@@@@ Oh, @@@@

58 NS: Porque, porque confirmemos mañana a las tres treinta.

59 NNS: Tres treinta mañana. Bueno, tu corte, tu pelo sí,

60 NS: Porque el día siguiente yo viajo, tengo que viajar y necesito, que mi pelo esté, en forma para este viaje. Okay.

61 NNS: Tu pelo. Oh, wait. Es bueno, ¿eh?

62 NS: Um hm.

63 NNS: Hasta mañana.

64 NS: Hasta mañana.

Situation #1b

5B - 2102/AM	NS - Female	(A)	NNS - Male	(M)
6B - 2102/PC	NS - Female	(P)	NNS - Female	(C)
7B - 2101/JP	NS - Male	(P)	NNS - Female	(J)
8B - 2101/SH	NS - Male	(H)	NNS - Female	(S)

Discourse Sample #5B

1 NNS: Um, ¿necesitas un appointa-?

2 NS: Sí, necesito cortarme el cabello, este, después del trabajo. Necesito hacer un viaje de negocios mañana.

3 NNS: Um, ¿qué tiempo es bueno para tú?

4 NS: Um, el tiempo, tengo, mis horas libres son de once y treinta a doce, y de tres a cuatro de la tarde. Y después de las cinco estoy libre. Y ¿cuáles, cuáles son las horas que Ud. tiene libres para la cita?

5 NNS: Um, @@@@@@@, I don't know what you said.

6 NS: Tres horas libres *cuándo tú puedes cortarme el cabello*.

7 NNS: Uh-uh. (indicator of non-understanding)

8 NS: ¿A qué hora? ¿A qué hora *tú* puedes darme la cita?

9 NNS: Uh, mis horas son nueve a diez, doce a uno, y no tengo horas completas.

10 NS: Mi horario es de nueve a once tengo trabajo, de once a doce lo tengo libre, pero a las doce tengo un almuerzo con un amigo de, eh, que viene, que viene de visita y, y quiere visitarme. Pero tengo trabajo de, a la una y media otra vez por mucho tiempo y tengo una reservación en un restaurante de doce a una y después de las doce tengo una reunión a las 2. Pero de tres a tres y media lo tengo libre.

11 NNS: Uh, no tengo un tiempo,

12 NS: ¿Después de las cinco?

13 NNS: Uh,

14 NS: ¿Está cerrado?

15 NNS: Sí.

16 NS: Y de las dos y media. Y de las tres a las tres y media?

17 NNS: Um, necesitas un hora completa.

18 NS: Um, porque a las cuatro tengo una cita con el doctor.

19 NNS: Sólo tengo de tres y media a cuatro.

20 NS: OK. A lo mejor vengo a esa hora si me, porque a las cuatro tengo una cita con el doctor y muy corto el tiempo.

21 NNS: @@@@@@@@@@

22 NS: ¿Me entiendes?

23 NNS: No, @@@@@@@@@@.

24 NS: OK. Muy poco tiempo para cortarme el cabello.

25 NNS: Ummm, porque a la @@@@ um, lo necesita hoy?

26 NS: Sí, porque mañana tengo un viaje de negocios importante y no creo que vaya a tener tiempo para venir para cortarme el cabello.

27 NNS: No ten@@@@@@@@@go tiempo. Lo siento.

28 NS: Bueno, por la mañana. Salgo a mediodía. ¿En la mañana estás libre?

29 NNS: Sí.

30 NS: ¿Cómo a qué hora?

31 NNS: Um, manaña de diez a doce.

32 NS: Ok. Está bien. Vuelvo manaña a las diez y media. Entonces, mañana a las diez y media.

33 NNS: Gracias.

34 NS. Muy bien.

Discourse Sample #6B

1 NNS: Hola.

2 NS: Uh, @@@ hola, @@@ OK, @@@.

3 NNS: I think you set an appointment with me.

4 NS: Ok. ¿A las once y media?

5 NNS: No, por:que yo como "lunch" de ese hora? Pero, uh, tengo uh doce y tengo, uh, nueve en la mañana.

6 NS: A las nueve de la mañana yo, yo tengo el trabajo. Y a las doce tengo que almorzar con mi mejor amigo.

7 NNS: Yo sé, pero tengo un "appointamento" a dos y media, y let's see, doce,

8 NS: A las dos y media tengo una reunión con el jefe, con mi jefe, a las dos y media.

9 NNS: Pero, uh, ¿doce y media está bien?

10 NS: ¿Doce y media? Tampoco. Voy a pasar por la ciudad.

11 NNS: ¿Uh, uno?

12 NS: ¿a la una? Uh, sí, este es mi, este es mi tiempo libre, sí tengo a la una.

13 NNS: ¿Pero no dos y media?

14 NS: No, no a las dos y media, porque a las dos y media tengo una reunión con mi jefe.

15 NNS: Ok,

16 NS: ¿Quizás a las, a las tres y media?

17 NNS: ¿Tres y media? Sí, tres. Uh, ¿tres? ¿Tres está bien?

18 NS: Sí,

19 NNS: Tres til cuatro, @@@@@@@@@@@@

20 NS: Bueno. Voy de tres a tres y media, media hora. A las cuatro tengo una cita con el doctor, ¿cuatro?

21 NNS: Sí, so tres til, from tres til cuatro, ¿es, está bien?

22 NS: Um,

23 NNS: porque yo tengo un "appointamento" a las tres pero,

24 NS: Lo puedes mover.

25 NNS: Sí.

26 NS: Cambiar.

27 NNS: So, tres, dos, pero no onc-, a la uno?

28 NS: No, a la una, es que, bueno, a la una sí puedo, ¿tú puedes a la una?

29 NNS: Pero no, no tengo, no tengo que comer, ¿entiendes? No es importante para mí.

30 NS: Ah, no es importante para tí. Ah, ok. Para mí, sí, @@@@@@@@@@@@

31 NNS: So, ¿qué horas está bueno para tú?

32 NS: ¿Para mí?

33 NNS: Sí.

34 NS: Yo puedo a las once y media.

35 NNS: A once y media to doce y media.

36 NS: ¿Once y media? Once y media, media, hasta las doce, media hora.

37 NNS: Pero quiero un hora.

38 NS: Ah, ok, entonces, um, ¿qué tal de tres a cuatro?

39 NNS: ¿Tres y cuatro?

40 NS: Sí.

41 NNS: Sí. Well, I have one appointament tres,

42 NS: [A las [tres.

43 NNS: [nada a tres y media, pero tengo un appointamento cuatro,

44 NS: um, ???, um

45 NNS: Tengo 'free time,' I don't know how to say it

46 NS: Tiempo libre.

47 NNS: Um, from doce to de uh dos

48 NS: ¿Doce a dos? Pero a las doce tengo un almuerzo con un amigo. Pero lo puedo, yo lo puedo cancelar.

49 NNS: Once

50 NS: Uh-huh. ¿Puede ser a, de las once y media hasta las 12:30?

51 NNS: ¿Once y media a doce y media?

52 NS: Uh-huh.

53 NNS: Once y media a doce y media. *Está bien.*

54 NS: ¿Para tí?

55 NNS: Once y media a doce y media.

56 NS: Sí.

57 NNS: Aquí. ¿Por aquí? ¿Once y media?

58 NS: Once y media. Once y media a doce y media.

59 NNS: Ah, tengo un "appointamento" once y media.

60 NS: Una cita, um,

61 NNS: ¿Doce de uno?

62 NS: ¿De doce a una? Um, sí.

63 NNS: Muy bien.

64 NS: Bueno, sí.

65 NNS: Hasta luego.

66 NS: Ok. Hasta luego.

Discourse Sample #7B

1 NS: Hola. ¿Cómo e(s)tás?

2 NNS: Ah..está bien. ¿y Ud?

3 NS: Bien, gracias. Me hace falta, tengo que cortarme el cabello y lo necesito, pero tengo el día muy ocuapdo.

4 NNS: OK.

5 NS: ¿Cuándo puedes cortarme el cabello?

6 NNS: Uh, uh, yo soy, um, @@@, ¿sesenta minutos a las nueve a.m.?

7 NS: No, a las nueve no puedo. Tengo trabajo desde las nueve de la mañana, a las nueve a. m. hasta las once a.m. Estoy unicamente libre en la mañana desde las once hasta las doce del día.

8 NNS: Uh, uh, yo tenga una...¿cómo se dice "appointment"?

9 NS: Cita.

10 NNS: ¿Cita? Um, a las once a ¿doce?

11 NS: Tampoco puedo. Viene un amigo de viaje y voy a comer con él y es su único tiempo libre.

¿Qué tal de las 3 de la tarde? De dos y media a tres y media.

12 NNS: Uh, um...yo tenga, uh yo tenga, uh. No, no es bueno, um, ((sigh)) ¿Manaña?

13 NS: Manaña.

14 NNS: Manaña a las doce o a las nueve.

15 NS: No, no. ¿Qué tal a las cinco de la tarde? Después de las cinco de la tarde.

16 NNS: Uh,

17 NS: A las cinco p. m.

18 NNS: Uh, um, la salón es fini a las 5.

19 NS: Es bueno. Ok. Entonces, a las cinco voy a estar aquí.

20 NNS: @@@@@.

21 NS: ¿Está bien?

22 NNS: NO. La salón, ah, la salón es, uh, ¿cómo se dice "closed"?

23 NS: Está cerra(d)o.

24 NNS: ¿Está cerra(d)o?

25 NS: Yes.

26 NNS: a las cinco.

27 NS: Um-hm.

28 NNS: Me, ... (2.0) me daré un telefóno de mi hermana y ella es una pelostilisto. ¿Cómo se dice "hairstyl [ist"?

29 NS: [Peluquera.

30 NNS: Peluquera. Tambien um, uh, ella ... (2.0) ella,

31 NS: ¿Ella puede tener tiempo a cortármerlo?

32 NNS: Sí.

33 NS: ¿A cuálquier hora?

34 NNS: Um, uh, sí, uh, (snaps fingers)) uh,

35 NS: Bueno, me interesa hablar con ella.

36 NNS: Sí.

37 NS: ¿Cuál es su teléfono?

38 NNS: Teléfono es siete seis tres, tres tres once, no, tres tres uno cinco.

39 NS: OK, perfecto. Se la llamo y a lo mejor puedo hablar con ella. OK. Gracias de toda manera.

40 NNS: Bien. De nada. @@@@@@@@

Discourse Sample #8B

1 NNS: @@@@@

2 NS: Ok, ¿Cómo es tu nombre?

3 NNS: Uh, me llamo S---.

4 NS: ¿Cómo es?

5 NNS: S---.

6 NS: Mi nombre es H---.

7 NNS: Huh?

8 NS: H---.

9 NNS: H---?

10 NS: H---.

11 NNS: OK. H---.

12 NS: Eh, ¿Qué, cuándo, cuándo tú tienes tiempo libre?

13 NNS: Uh, soy, uh, libre a nueve y diez @@@@@@ a diez.

14 NS: Nueve a diez. But, pero, pero yo tengo trabajo a las nueve.

15 NNS: Ah, sí. Uh, tambien soy libre uh, desde a uno. ... (6.0) Desde, desde la una.

16 NS: Eh, yo tengo, tengo que almorzar con unos amigos.

17 NNS: Ah, sí.

18 NS: No tengo tiempo,

19 NNS: Uh, uh, soy libre a dos a dos y media tambien, uh, ¿Tú libre then? luego, @@@@@@@@

20 NS: @@@@. Eh, tengo una reunión con mi jefe sobre el trabajo.

21 NNS: Oh, soy uh libre 3:30 a 4:00? Uh,

22 NS: Um,

23 NNS: Su libre, wait, tu libre,

24 NS: No.

25 NNS: ¿No? @@@@@ ¿No? @@@@@@@@@

26 NS: Tengo una cita con el doctor.

27 NNS: Ok, oh. ¿cuándo uh, libres, cuándo, @@@@@, wait, wait, wait, ¿cuándo uh tienes ... (4.0) libre,

28 NS: tiempo

29 NNS: tiempe

30 NS: tiempo

31 NNS: tiempo libre

32 NS: Yo tengo tiempo libre todos los días cinco de la tarde.

33 NNS: ¿Cinco?

34 NS: Sí.

35 NNS: Uh, ah cinco. Soy libre cinco ahora, uh,

36 NS: Cinco de la tarde.

37 NNS: OK, uh, hac- a ((whispered)) I don't know how to say un appoint-

38 NS: Cita.

39 NNS: ¿Cita? Hace, wait, uh, una cita a cinca @@@@@. ¿Sí? Vale.

40 NS: Vale.

41 NNS: Vale.

42 NS: ¿Tú tienes cita a las cinco?

43 NNS: Sí, uh,

44 NS: ¿Cuándo tienes tiempo libre?

45 NNS: La fecha? The date, fecha, is that it?

46 NS: ¿Cuándo tú tienes tiempo libre?

47 NNS: Um, ...(3.0) Después uh, cinco de tarde.

48 NS: Um hm.

49 NNS: Ok. Sí, @@@@ tú libre, wait, are you free, Eres libre después de=

50 NS: =estás libre.

51 NNS: Estás, sí, bien, @@@@ I, uh, ... (4.0),

52 NS: Estoy libre a las cinco de la tarde=

53 NNS: =Sí,

54 NS: pero tú estás ocupada.

55 NNS: Uh, soy libre después, uh,

56 NS: Estoy.

57 NNS: Estoy libre cinco de tarde por uh, pelo cut, for a haircut, what am I trying to say?

58 NS: Cortar el pelo.

59 NNS: OK. Um,

60 NS: ¿Cuándo, cuándo puedes cortarme el pelo?

61 NNS: Mañana, no, mañana,

62 NS: ¿Mañana?

63 NNS: Sí, mañana, lunes a cinco de tarde. How do you say o'clock?

64 NS: Cinco exacto.

65 NNS: Cinco exacto. ¿Sí?

66 NS: T no tienes trabajo a las cinco de la tarde?

67 NNS: No, no tengo trabajar a cinco de tarde. Después, are you saying after cinco exacto?

68 NS: Eh, bien. Manana a las cinco.

69 NNS: Sí, @@@@@@@

70 NS: Hasta luego, @@@@

71 NNS: Hasta luego, @@@@

Free conversation - Discourse Sample 9C

The following is a transcribed excerpt of a multiparty conversation. NS participants include M (mother), JM (father), Mon (older daughter), C (younger daughter); NNS (me, their houseguest). The conversation begins in the kitchen between M and NNS; later, the others join in.

1 M: Voy a poner éste...esta hoja.

2 NNS: Sí.

3 M: Es la hoja de anís. Pero ése es de curandero ¡Ay:: [i:::!!

4 NNS: [Parece medicina de curandero.

5 M: [@@@@@@@@@. Eso es lo que va ?????

6 NNS: ¿Se sirve=se sirve así?

7 M: ((non-verbal))

((música))

8 M: Buena ésa,

9 NNS: Tal vez se fueron::de vacaciones.

10 M: ¿Mmmm?

11 NNS: ¿Tal vez se fueron de vacaciones?

12 M: No, ellos regresan y salieron. Ellos van a una media hora de camino de aquí que están sus familiares=

13 NNS: =uh-huh=

14 M: =a La Vega. Ellos van regularmente para allá y regresan de noche ya a acostarse. Ay, ¡'tá caliente! Voy a poner ésto,

15 C: ???

16 NNS: ¿Qué es? ¿Otra hoja de anís?

17 M: Jalar de pus. ¡A probarla !Ufff, chilá, <<¡YE [EOW!>>

18 C: [@@@@@@@@@

19 M: [Anda, Claudia, ¿se han venido? Ve cómo se tiende la ropa afuera. Tal vez la de él está en la lavadora lavada ya. Ay, yo no me acordaba, pa' que se la lleve limpia pa' que no se lleve la ropa sucia. Cierra la puerta. Tiéndela afuera. Este, abre la puerta que ahí amanece seca que yo quiero que él lleve la ropa limpia. ¿No ves a nadie? Voy añadir ..., tocaron en el vidrio y yo vi la sombra ahí. ¿Quién es?

((entra JM))

20 JM: OK. ¿Bon apetit?

21 M: No.

((mirando la telenovela))

22 NNS: ¡Qué vestido!=

23 C: =@@@@@@@@=

24 NNS: =¡qué pierni [ta!

25 C: [@@@@@@@@@@

26 M: Parece muslito de pollo.

27 Mon: Eso es feita.

28 JM: Fea.

29 M: Fea del carajo pero tiene un cuerpo,

30 Mon: Eso es ??? [???

C: [Mamí...

32 M: ¿Qué?

33 C: Han venido yá.

34 M: Tanto bonito y tiene mal cuerpo.
¡Qué vestido, qué piernita!=

35 NNS: =@@@@@

36 Mon: ??? Yo veo un, un cuerpo y un cabello largo que yo creí que era una mujer con una colita. Y cuando voltea y es un hombre...

37 JM: Igualito a nicaragüense ése que canta salsa

38 M: Ah, no, no es tan bonito. ¿Cómo es que se llama?

39 Mon: Luis Enrique.

40 JM: Tiene que ser un pajarón. Sí, es.

41 M: No, mi'ha, igualito a Juan Gabriel. ¿Oíste, mi'hita? ((cantando)) *ay nya nya* ??? Sí, señor. ??? todos pajaritos a ti te gustan. Oye, ¿por qué tú ???

42 NNS: ¡Mira esa rubia!

43 JM: ¡Wow!

44 M: Tremenda rubia.

45 Mon: No me gustan...???

46 NNS: Oye, nos pusimos a reír.

47 M: ¿Cuándo vas al campo de golf?

48 JM: En la tarde/

49 M: /¿en la tarde?:: Me gustaría ir contigo.

((Abre una puerta))

50 M: ¿La tendieron toda, mi hija?

51 Mon: Sí.

52 M: Afuera, a recogerla por la mañana, para La Vega van por la mañana cuando yo me levanto.

53 JM: ???

54 M: Con quién se va ella ahora? Los lleva: a la linea de carros. ???

55 JM: ¿Cuándo=hoy?

56 M: No, ¿cuándo fue que tu papa llamó? ¿ayer?

57 JM: ¿Por qué crees que ??? ¿Quién? ???

58 M: ???

59 JM: ¿Qué?

60 M: Ahora yo le pregunté

61 JM: ¿Por qué te quieres ir?

62 Mon: Voy a llorar. *Yo voy a llorar*.

63 M: Ay, ¡qué feo!

64 C: *Ay, no*.

65 NNS: Ese ladrón! @@@@@@@@@

66 C: [@@@@@@@@@@

67 JM: [@@@@@@@@@@

68 M: [@@@@@@@@@@...*woo-hoo*!

69 Mon: ???

70 JM: Así me pongo cuando me pongo a tomar ron.

71 C: Así.

72 NNS: ¡AH: Texas Tornadoes! Freddy Fender, Doug Sahm,

73 JM: [Freddy Fender,

74 M: Sabes montar a caballo: Stuart?

75 NNS: He montado a caballo varios, varias veces.

76 JM: ((cantando)) *vaqueros para el corral, arriando todo, todito el ganado,*

77 M: Ya debe estar viejo.

78 JM: Freddy Fender cantaba "Roses are Red."

79 C: @@@@@@@@@@@@. Va la primera?

80 M: Se fue él a dormir

81 NNS: No, se iba a casar.

82 ?: ¿Pero éso está igual,

83 M: Parece un traje de boda

84 NNS: ¿De veras? Bueno, pues, @@@@@@@@@@@@

85 C: [@@@@@@@@@@

86 Mon: [@@@@@@@@@@

87 M: ¿Qué es ésto? @@@@@@@@ Mira, pues hecho.

88 C: [@@@@@@@@@@@@

89 NNS: Anda llorando.

90 ?: Gracias mami, gracias papi.

91 NNS: Con su traje de boda.

92 M: Uh-huh. Se aparece el novio ahí a la iglesia de una vez están listos,

93 C: *Y él va a llorar*.

94 ?: Gracias papi, gracias Tato.

95 C: No podía hablar más.

96 JM: ((cantando))

97 NNS: Cuando andaba regresando de noche de la universidad el otro día, cuando el guardián me dejó salir de la puerta, me dijo, me dijo, uh, "Mucho cuida(d)o. ¡Hay mucho ladrón por aquí!"

98 M: ¡AY, Di:os mí:o! Cualquiera se muere de asusto @@@@@ Y ¿qué, qué tú le dijiste?

99 NNS: Uh, favor de:de pararse allá y cuidarme, @@@@@@@.

100 C: [@@@@@@@

101 Mon: [@@@@@@@

102 M: [@@@@@@. ¿Favor de pararse allá y cuidarme? @@@ @@@ @@@ Vigílame desde allí.

103 NNS: Y lo hizo.

104 M: ¿Sí?

105 NNS: Uh-huh. Y andaba con palo grande.

106 M: Yo te cuido, yo te cuido, con un palo, @@@@@@@@

107 C: [@@@@@@@

108 Mon: [@@@@

109 M: [¡Qué sorprendida estoy! ¿y ese palo? Con un pedazo de palo, @@@@. Bueno, con ese palo, estoy llegando de noche de la universidad, que le agarró un pedazo de palo. No quiero problemas. Déjame entrar, ésto es pa' @@@@@@@@

110 Cl: [@@@@@@@@

111 M: [@@@@

112 NNS: [@@@@@@

113 M: [defenderme,

114 NNS: [@@@@@@@@@

115 M: [Parece que tú te has vuelto @@@ a acabar con alguien, @@@@@.

116 NNS: Bueno. Yo no sabía. @@@@@@@. Me da pena quedar mal,

117 Cl: [@@@@@@@@

118 S: ???

119 Mon: ???

120 M: Hay que estar preparada ???

121 NNS: Uh-huh. ¿Darle golpes, @@@@@@@@@, CON GANAS!

122 M: Eso es un garrote=lo que tú traías. ¿Sabes qué es un garrote?

123 Cl: [Mamí,

124 NNS: ¿Qué?

125 M: Ese palo se llama un garrote.

126 NNS: ¿Garrote?

127 Cl: [Mamí,

128 M: Y le caen a agarrotazos.

129 NNS: [@@@@@@@@@@@

130 C: E::xacto.

131 JM: [El palo que tenía el Presidente Roosevelt

132 NNS: [@@@@@@@ Walk softly and carry a big @@@ stick @@@@@@@

133 JM: [@@@@@, ése es un garrote.

134 M: [@@@@@, garrote.

135 C: [¿Mamí?

136 M: Dime.

137 C: Le quería decir que...con un palo...?

138 JM: Es como la política que usaba que parecía simpático

139 NNS: [@@@@@

140 JM: [con los otros países pero tenía un garrote abrochado cuando se descuidaban.

141 M: Dale una cacha [da,

142 NNS: [¡un chinga: [zo!/

143 C: [@@@@@@@

144 M: [¡AY, AY, AY!

145 JM: Un palo, un chingazo...@@@@@@@

146 M: Mira cómo le gustó...*AH:hah*

147 C: [Mami. Habla ella como hablaba Wanda..@@@@@@@...Se parece como hablaba Wanda.

148 JM: ((cantando a la mexicana)) *Nohombre*

149 M: [Nohombre

150 JM: *[Andale, hombre*, los mexicanos sí hablan cantando un poquito; dicen, *ándale...*"

151 NNS: Uh @@@@@@@ huh.

ABRUPT TOPIC SHIFT...

152 M: ??? Van a dar nada más cada mes siete horas de conversación por lo que tú pagas. Y después todo lo de ahí y en adelante/

153 JM: [Pero hay otra

154 M: /por cada minuto

155 JM: [compañia que se va a establecer ya dentro que no será un monopolio.

156 M: Uh-huh. Esto también me dijo Yolanda. Y que si:si la otra da mejores condiciones y no fuñe tanto=va a perder ??? mucho,

157 JM: [pero siete horas de conversación por mes es mucho tiempo...

158 M: Pues, sí, aquí debe conversarse de 20 o a 30 horas al mes=

159 JM: =No, no debe ser.

160 NNS: [¿Pero de:larga distancia o?

161 M: No, local.

162 NNS: [*Sh@@@@it*. ¿Siete horas? No@@@o.

163 C: [Siete horas

164 Mon: [al mes

165 JM: [Y cada conversación por cada minuto. Yo voy a quitar el teléfono si se sigue así que no puedo llamar aquí nunca.

166 NNS: Hay que conseguir "call waiting," entonces.

167 JM: ¿Cómo es?

168 NNS: "Call waiting," @@@@@@@@@

169 JM: [¿Cómo se hace?

170 NNS: Parece como dos lineas=

171 M: =dos lineas=

172 NNS: =con un número=

173 M: =con un número. Claro. Sí, éso es lo que tenemos que hacer.

VITA

Stuart Lee Stewart was born and raised in Bryan, Texas, the only child of Arthur and Billie Stewart. Her interest in Spanish was piqued by the reading of her father's high school Spanish text and his pronunciation of many of the words for her. She continued to enjoy the language in three years of study in junior high school. She attended Stephen F. Austin High School in Bryan, and obtained a Bachelor of Arts degree in Modern Languages from Texas A&M University in 1973. After a 15-year working career in the oil industry in Houston, Texas, she returned to graduate school in 1990 and earned a Master of Arts degree in Spanish from Texas A&M in 1992. From there, she ventured over to Baton Rouge, Louisiana, where she enrolled in the doctoral program in Linguistics. Summers at the Linguistics Institute in Albuquerque, New Mexico, in 1995 and at the Summer Institute of Language and Culture at Pitzer College in Claremont, California, in 1996 supplemented her theoretical linguistic training and expanded her pedagogical views, providing her with invaluable information, much of which is reflected in this document. Her degree to be awarded in May of 2000 is the culmination of a decade of study and a wealth of experience beyond her wildest dreams. She and her fiancé, Richard

Maloney, will marry in March of 2000 and make their home in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. where Stuart will continue her teaching and research.

DOCTORAL EXAMINATION AND DISSERTATION REPORT

Candidate: Stuart Lee Stewart

Major Field: Linguistics

Title of Dissertation: What Goes on in Cross-Language Encounters: The Tactics and Strategies of Interactional Grammar

Approved:

Jim Brody
Major Professor and Chairman

Dean of the Graduate School

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

Stephen K. Bucky Jr.

Jon B. Scott

Wadija

W D Gowie

Date of Examination:

12/15/99